

Can.
Pam. Borland, John

LETTERS

TO A MEMBER OF THE WESLEYAN METHODIST CHURCH; IN
WHICH CERTAIN REFLECTIONS AGAINST PROTESTANT-
ISM, AND VARIOUS ASSUMPTIONS IN FAVOUR OF
ROMANISM, PUT FORTH BY AN ECCLESIASTIC
OF ROME, ARE EXAMINED AND REFUTED.

BY REVD. JOHN BORLAND,

PASTOR OF THE WESLEYAN METHODIST CHURCH, ST. JOHNS, CANADA.

MONTREAL:

"WITNESS" PRINTING HOUSE.

1873.

LETTERS

TO A MEMBER OF THE WESLEYAN METHODIST CHURCH; IN
WHICH CERTAIN REFLECTIONS AGAINST PROTESTANT-
ISM, AND VARIOUS ASSUMPTIONS IN FAVOUR OF
ROMANISM, PUT FORTH BY AN ECCLESIASTIC
OF ROME, ARE EXAMINED AND REFUTED.

BY REVD. JOHN BORLAND,
PASTOR OF THE WESLEYAN METHODIST CHURCH, ST. JOHNS, CANADA.

MONTREAL:
"WITNESS" PRINTING HOUSE, 218 AND 220 ST. JAMES STREET.

1873.

ADVERTISEMENT.

A member of the Methodist Church of this Town has lately been addressed by an ecclesiastic of the Church of Rome, on the danger of his condition as a Protestant, and of the great desirableness of his speedily seeking admission into that Church.

The means employed were letters, two in number, which, when received, were shown to the writer of this, because of the fact, doubtless, that he was pastor to the person addressed in them.

The first letter was devoted to an explanation of the unbecoming and dangerous conduct of Protestants in refusing to render, as was thought, the homage and veneration due to the Virgin Mary, and that the conduct of Romanists herein was in striking contrast to that of the Protestant. A suitable reply was prepared and sent to this communication, when it was soon intimated that a second letter might be expected, in which subjects in controversy would be handled at greater length and in greater fulness.

After several weeks the looked for epistle arrived ; and was found to be in length at least,—extending as it did over twenty-five pages, foolscap,—all that was promised. In it was discussed *directly*, the differing “ Rules of Faith ” of the Protestant and Romanist Churches ; while, *incidentally*, a number of other particulars were introduced and dwelt upon of much moment in the points of controversy between the two Churches.

The whole matter now assumed a form and dimension of considerable interest, which induced the conclusion that the treatment and reply to the questions before us, should be put before the public for its more general consideration and judgment.

This is now done, but without any desire to reflect upon the conduct of the ecclesiastic who has opened this discussion ; for whatever may be thought of his *method* of treating the subjects brought under consideration, all should unite in commending the *zeal* that has sought to rescue a fellow being from what is thought to be fearfully perilous error. It is thus the Romanist views the condition of the Protestant ; and therefore is he consistent with the Christianity he professes only, when in the use of Christian means he seeks his enlightenment and conversion ; and while I freely accord this liberty to the Romanist, nay, while I think that he only acts consistently when he uses it, I, as a Protestant, who believes as strongly in the dangerously erroneous condition of the Romanist as he can of the Protestant, claim the same right to perform for him a solemn and sacred duty, as I wish him to do for me. And sincerely do I trust that the time will yet come, when in a spirit of Christian candour and fairness religious truth, as affecting any party, can be, and shall be, discussed and enquired into by persons of all shades of difference,—especially when those differences involve fundamental principles,—until all the chaff of error is fully blown away, and nought shall be found to remain but the wheat of truth which may supply to every hungry soul the bread of eternal life.



LETTER I.

CONDUCT COMMENDED—PARTICULARS OBJECTIONABLE—KNOWLEDGE DEFECTIVE—NOT RESPONSIBLE FOR SOCINIANISM—RULES OF FAITH STATED AND CONSIDERED—ABSURD SUPPOSITION—NUMEROUS SECTS IN THE CHURCH OF ROME—FANATICISM AND EXTRAVAGANCE—CASES REFERRED TO—REASON FOR WITHHOLDING THE SCRIPTURES EXPOSED—SHOULD BE WITHHELD FROM THE PRIESTHOOD.

MY DEAR L.,—In reflecting upon the professed object of your “friend,” as stated in his letters to you, viz., to induce you “to go back to your Mother Church,” I cannot but commend his zeal to do you what he doubtless believed to be an essential service; for, however plain and obvious his error in asking you to go back to where you never had been; and in styling the Church of Rome your Mother Church, when to her you were never indebted for anything,—yet his design evidently was to rescue you from a condition which he regards as eminently perilous, and to introduce you where only, as he thinks, you can be forever safe. I commend, I say, his zeal to serve you; for it cannot in any sense be considered *Christlike* to leave a fellow creature under the influence of fatal and destructive error—for in this light Romanists regard Protestantism, and *vice versa*—without an effort to enlighten him. Efforts of this kind are guided and encouraged by the Apostle when he says: “Let him know, that he which converteth the sinner from the error of his way shall save a soul from death, and shall hide a multitude of sins.” James v. 20.

Still, notwithstanding, my reference to that which in his conduct is commendatory, I cannot conceive why he should have endeavored in his correspondence to conceal his name and person—a circumstance which has proved to be utterly vain and futile. This is unworthy of him, for it looks as though he were ashamed of the cause he desires to serve, or, at least, of his manner of doing it.

Then, again, I think he should have taken more pains to understand the subjects on which he has sought to enlighten you, than is apparent in his communications. For it is pretty evident that he does not understand Protestantism, against which he lifts to you his warning voice; while even on the subject of Romanism—*his own ism*—assuming that he has written on it as he understands it—his information might and ought to be very much improved. It is easy to imagine from the restrictive rules and regulations of the Roman Church, that but a very limited, and therefore a very imperfect, knowledge of the Protestant faith can be acquired by any of its members. But surely no such obstacles are in the way to a full and proper knowledge of their own faith. On the part of the Ecclesiastics of the Church the probability is, that he does not say all he knows of his system, but that only which on this occasion would suit his purpose with you. You should, at any rate, have a fuller exposition of Romanism than your “friend” has given you, and that service I will render you ere I put down my pen.

Your "friend" begins his last and longest letter by a comparison of the Protestant with the Romanist rule of faith ; and the conclusion which he reaches is evidently most satisfactory to himself. What it would be to others, who really understand the questions at issue, is quite another thing. This each thoughtful reader will decide for himself.

He speaks of three rules of faith as existing amongst Protestants in the following manner :—

"Of the three rules of faith. I. The Socinian rule of faith, they hold that *reason* is the interpreter of that divine revelation" (the Bible) ; II. "Private inspiration," which he says is "the rule of faith adopted by the Anabaptists, the Quakers, the Moravian Brothers, and the Methodists, which consists that God inspires each one of them" ; III. "The Bible, which is your third false rule of faith."

The above, to go no farther, shows that your "friend" needs very much to be enlightened on that on which he seeks to enlighten you ; and that ere he attempted to instruct a Protestant on the subject of his faith he should have become more fully informed on that subject himself. But this is one of many instances, ever and anon occurring, which shows a remarkable defectiveness of knowledge of the leading characteristics of the Protestant faith on the part of Romanists ; and it forces upon us, Protestants, the conclusion that either they will not do justice to themselves in studying it, or that they purposely misrepresent it in order to prejudice all minds they can influence against it. But this they should know is no way to advance the interests of *truth* ; and he certainly must feel that he has a bad cause to uphold who resorts to it.

Of Socinians or Unitarians, and their rule of faith, Protestants might well excuse themselves from making any reference, much less a defence ; for with them, in their faith and religious life, the Protestant proper can have no bonds of sympathy or union. But as their rule of faith, as it is called, is held up as strikingly improper, and as their condition is supposed to be confirmatory of that conclusion, I will bestow upon it a passing notice. And in doing so, I observe, there are two extremes in the religious world on this very subject, reason, in interpreting the Word of God. The Socinian is at one point, and the Romanist at the other. The one gives too great a scope for reason, the other too little. For instance, the Socinian presumes to bring to the bar of his reason the *nature* of certain truths with which his reason, or that of any finite creature, is altogether incompetent to deal. Were he to employ his reason with the *statements*, simply, of such Scriptures as, for instance, those profoundly mysterious truths of the plurality of persons in the Godhead, the hypostatical union of natures in the person of Christ, &c., then would reason have its true and legitimate field of action, and no exception could consistently lie against him. For, assuredly, God Himself appeals to the use of reason in man, and calls for its exercise in a number of instances ; indirectly, in His many remonstrances and counsels given for thoughtful consideration and action ; and, directly, when, as in Isaiah 1 : 18 He says : "Come now, and let us *reason* together, saith the Lord."

Nor does the Romish hierarchy fail to recognize the existence and use of reason when by argument, supported by Scriptural quotations, they would sustain

their assumptions and demands upon the people. Then why, it surely may be asked, refer to it in one instance and ignore its use in the other? The only reply of which this question is susceptible is, because they have engrafted so many absurd and unscriptural dogmas and practices upon the faith and usages of the primitive church, that they greatly fear detection, with its attendant and necessary consequences.

So great and glaringly inconsistent with every office of reason is the conduct of the Church of Rome in many particulars, that we may not wonder at the attempt it makes to stifle its voice. Yet they ought to know that they are the last people in the world to point a finger even at the Socinian, or, by any means, to stir up an enquiry into the office and use of reason in matters of religion; for to a properly enlightened mind it must ever be held as a monstrous supposition that God should cause a book to be written which even in its incomplete condition, as under the Jewish dispensation, was found worthy of the most lavish praise, and to be commended to all classes of men for constant reading and application,—as by holy men of God it was so praised and commended,—should now in its perfected form be found to be so dangerous, yea, even so fraught with deadliest evils, that to denounce it, to burn or otherwise to destroy it, and to punish most severely any who should read or circulate it, should be regarded by any, as by the Church it has long been so regarded, a solemnly imposed and imperative duty. This, I repeat, is a *monstrous supposition*, and could never be entertained by any people who had not abandoned the right use of their reason in matters so clearly within its office and their solemn and never to be abandoned responsibilities to God, their Redeemer and Judge.

Your “friend” objects to the Bible as a rule of faith because such a license, he considers, begets Socinianism and multitudinous sects and parties, &c., &c. But if even this were so, no judicious mind but would hesitate ere he took a step so manifestly in opposition to the order of God, as seen in all ages of the past. But is it so, as your friend asserts? Does the proper use—I say proper use for that is the light in which the thing is to be viewed—of God’s Word lead to such a result? I say no—*emphatically no!*—and demand the proof of such a charge, yea, such a reflection, on the wisdom and goodness of God; for if God has given us His Word by which to enlighten and bless us, then to bring forward such a charge, and to make it a reason for treating the Bible as the Church of Rome has long been known to do, is conduct too audacious and wicked to receive apology from any man professing himself to be a Christian. But, let me ask you, is there any good thing which God has bestowed upon man that is not susceptible of abuse, or that has not been abused? And yet has any sane man made the attempt to set aside the Divinely-bestowed blessing in order to do away with the man-created evil? Many men take the grain which God has given us for our sustenance, and convert it into alcohol; but do we, therefore, because of this, advocate the destruction of the grain or the suppression of its growth?

But ere your “friend” should have thought of urging this plea,—*the use of the Bible as a rule of faith*,—he should have felt able to prove that no such evils have ever attended the Romanist Rule of faith. Does he not know—for assuredly he ought not to be ignorant of facts so clearly recorded in history, and that by author-

ities of his own Church—that anterior to the reformation by Luther, there were, as since that period there have been, and still are, sects and parties in the Roman Church as numerous and as widely divergent in principle and practice one from another, as there are or ever have been amongst Protestants? You have only to look over any respectable ecclesiastical dictionary to be assured of this. As you may not, however, have such at hand, I will give you a list which I rather hurriedly gather from one lying beside me. In the Church of Rome are the following sects, or orders, as they call them :—The Augustinians, the Annunciade, the Armedians, the Apostolina, the Benedictines, the Barnabites, the Bartholomites, the Berengarians, the Beguines, the Bernardines, the Bethlehemites, the Bogomites, the Bollandists, the Bourignonists, the Bridgetines, the Calendarum Fraters, the Camaldolites, the Caperolans, the Capuchins, the Caputiati, the Carmelites, the Carthusians, the Catharists, the Celestines, the Cellites, the Cistercian Monks, the St. Clare Nuns, the Cenobite, the Confalon, the Convolutionists, the Cordeliers, the Dominicans, the Eoquinians, the Eremites, the Feuillantes, the Flagellants, the Franciscans, the Gilbertines, the Gyrovagi, the Hebdomadarie, the Henriicians, the Heysichasts, the Hospitalers, the Illuminati, the Jansenists, the Jesuits, the Jesuates, the Joachimites, the Jovinians, Leucopetrians, the Mendicants, the Molinists, the Sarabaites, the Scotists, the Servites, the Synodites, the Theateries, the Thomists, the Trappists, the Urselines, &c., &c., &c. Now here is a string of sects—and I feel assured that a little industrious research would very much enlarge it—found in the Church of Rome. And yet such men as your “friend” are ever casting up to Protestants the number of sects into which they are split, and the sad evils that are said to result therefrom.

I am aware that your “friend” and his co-religionists will here lift their eyes with affected astonishment at what I now say, and exclaim, with much real or pretended feeling, “*Why! these are only so many orders in the Church of Rome and not sects, as among Protestants! They are all of the one Church, inasmuch as they hold the Pope as their common head and the laws of the Church as their common rule.*” Just so; and I will add that the Protestant sects (those that are such in truth and reality) are all orders of the one Church of Christ; for they hold to Christ as their common Head and to His Word as their common law,—the only rule of their faith and practice,—their only difference from the sects of the Romish Church being that they hold to Christ as *their only Head, who is invisible*; while the Romanists hold to the *Pope as their only head, who is visible*. A slight difference in one respect, but a great and important difference in another.

Another fact which ought to be known in this connection, is: that for wild fanaticism and extravagance, no sects that have ever risen up among Protestants can be compared to many in the Church of Rome. I may instance, for example, the Bollandists, the Flagellants, and the Convolutionists. Well authenticated accounts of these, and that by authorities of their own Church—as with various other authorities, see Edgar’s “Variations of Popery,” (a work of profound and extensive research, in which not less than one hundred and fifty Romanist authors of highest standing are quoted),—can be readily given, if your “friend” or any of *his friends*, entertain any doubts as to the correctness of my statement.

On this subject Edgar remarks : "Arianism, Swedenborgianism, Flagellism, Southcottianism, and other errors have erected their pretentious and fantastic heads. The clamor of Arianism, the nonsense of Swedenborgianism, the ravings of Southcottianism, have blended in mingled discord and in full cry."

"But all these or similar kinds of schism and heresy appeared, in all their enormity, many ages before the Reformation. Division arose in the Church from its origin, in the days of apostolic truth and purity. Irenæus, who flourished in the second century, attacked the errors of his day, and his work on this subject fills a full volume in folio. These errors, in the days of Epiphanius, in the fourth century, had increased to eighty, and in the time of Philaster to an hundred and fifty. Their number continued to augment with the progress of time, and their systems equalled those of the moderns in extravagance. Schism and heresy prevailed to a more alarming extent before than since the establishment of Protestantism in its present form. Later are but a revival of former errors and delusions, which flourished at a distant period, and, preserved from oblivion by the historian, swell the folios of ecclesiastical antiquity.

"These illusions, however, the reformers never countenanced, but on the contrary opposed. * * *

"The Romish priesthood and people, on the contrary, have in every age fostered fanaticism and absurdity. Every foolery of sectarianism, which, though unconnected with Protestantism, arose since the Reformation and disgraced religion, has nestled in the bosom of Popery, and been cherished by its priesthood and people. Arianism, an affiliated branch of Socinianism, claims the honor of antiquity, and was patronized by Liberius (Pope) and by the councils of Sirmium, Seleucia, and Ariminum. The extravagance of Montanism, as Tertullian relates, was patronized by the contemporary pope and rivalled the fanaticism of Swedenborgianism. The Pontiff, says Godeau, gave Montanus letters of peace, which showed that he had been admitted to his communion (Godeau's words are : "Le Pape lui avait donné des lettres pacifiques, qui montraient qu'il l'avait admis à sa communion." His holiness, says Rhenan, *Montanized*. Victor, says Bruys, approved the prophesying of Montanus, Priscilla, and Maximilla. The mania of Joanna Southcott in modern times is eclipsed by the dreams of Beata Clara, and Nativity." Edgar, Vars., pp. 33 & 34.

The ravings of these Romish ladies is an astonishing comment on the conduct of Rome in dealing with cases of religious fanaticism and madness. That they should have been countenanced by authorities in the church is marvellous indeed, and should forever shut their mouths against any extravagance in the shape of religious excitements whenever or by whomsoever exhibited.

Your "friend's" remarks on the "absurdity of an ignorant countryman pretending to interpret the Holy Scriptures," are quite beside all the facts of the case. The instances are very rare indeed in which any such thing is attempted, for the illiterate of the Protestant churches, generally as a rule, look up to their pastors for expository lessons on the Word of God, so that while they do not, nor are they desired, blindly to follow any teacher, nor secure from any one a statement that to them appears contradictory of the general teachings of the sacred volume, yet they

hail with thankfulness the teachings of those who for piety and learning they believe qualified to instruct and guide them.

Rational and Scriptural independence, growing out of a sense of personal and individual responsibility of which none can divest himself, is inculcated upon all.

Another fact I will notice ere I close this letter, which is the following: The church of Rome, in denying the use of the Scriptures to the laity, assign as a reason for such, that divisions and the multiplication of sects would be certain to follow a free and unfettered use of the holy book. But what is the testimony of the past on this very subject—a testimony which sweeps away at once the plea of the Church and the argument of your “friend”? Why that sects and divisions have ever originated with the clergy, and not with the laity. This fact has heretofore had but little if any place in the consideration of this question. Yet so clearly is it the fact of history, that I charge it home upon the Church of Rome, in order that henceforth they may be consistent and at once change their course of proceeding, by restricting most rigidly the use of the Scriptures to the clergy, and by giving to the laity the fullest liberty to use them when and as they please.

But the reason for withholding the Scriptures from the laity, and in discouraging their use very generally, is quite different from the one referred to here. *The contrast* of the Church of Rome in its *offices*, its *spirit*, and its *working*, to that of the Church of the apostles and primitive Christians is too great to be held up to the gaze and consideration of intelligent people, *as it would be were the Scriptures in constant and general use*. Hence, as there is no disposition on the part of the Church to return to first principles and practices,—a thing scarcely possible anent professions of infallibility so freely made,—the Scriptures must, if possible, be suppressed, and the Church, i. e. the clergy, be saved all such painful and dangerous annoyances as would then be sure to arise.

More of this in my next.

Yours in Christian regard,

JOHN BORLAND.

April, 1873.

LETTER II.

THE CHURCH OF ROME REMARKABLE FOR ASSUMING—THEIR RULE OF FAITH DEFECTIVE—SUPPLIED FROM THE COUNCIL OF TRENT—REASONS FOR QUESTIONING “A FRIEND’S” ORTHODOXY—GREAT NEED OF INFALLIBLE DIRECTION—UNANIMOUS CONSENT OF THE FATHERS—NEVER KNOWN TO BE CONFLICTING VIEWS STATED—IMPORTANT QUESTIONS SKED—ELLIOTT ON THE RULE OF FAITH—ROMANISTS’ RULE UNMANAGEABLE AND IMPOSSIBLE—PROTESTANT ONE SIMPLE—EASY OF APPLICATION—SCRIPTURES GENERALLY BEFORE, AT, AND ETC., SUBSEQUENT TO OUR LORD’S TIME.

MY DEAR L.,—

The Church of Rome is remarkable for its assumptions. It assumes most confidently to be *the true Church* of God—the only true Church of God—and as such the only source of authority to settle the meaning of the Holy Scriptures, and

thus to lay before the world the absolutely certain rule of faith and of practice. Nor do their assumptions end here ; for, virtually at least, they assume that Protestants have neither books nor brains by which to detect the emptiness of such assumptions, and the frail foundations on which they rest ; and, therefore, they may as a consequence present them when and as they please without any fear of detection or of exposure. "Your friend" appears to partake largely of this, to them, common spirit, and he therefore presumes to take liberties with, as he doubtless thinks, uninformed and unsophisticated Protestants, vainly supposing that they have no means wherewith to meet and refute him.

But he shall be met, and his statements and arguments examined and sifted ; when we shall see what of them, as wheat, will remain ; and what as chaff will be blown away.

He states his own rule of faith to be as follows : " All truly inspired Scripture and divine tradition interpreted, not by the ignorant, nor even by the learned, but by the pastors sent and ordained by the true Church of God." If he were asked what he means by "divine tradition," his answer, I apprehend, would be amusing ; especially as required to show where such tradition was formed, and how preserved. The term "divine" is foisted in to prepare the way for giving to tradition an equal authority with the "inspired Scripture." For why should the "inspired Scripture" be put above "tradition?" If the one be divine, the other, although inspired, is but divine also. There is sophistry here, and therefore I call you to note it.

Then, again, the definition is far from being complete ; as by consulting the decrees of the Council of Trent may at once be discovered. And, further, it should have struck your "friend" that since the last council, which declared the Pope infallible, the whole thing is changed. Now the rule of faith should be understood to be : " All truly inspired Scripture and divine tradition as interpreted by the Pope ; together with all and sundry additions, emendations, and corrections, which he from time to time may deem it right and proper to make to them."

If, however, he prefers his own definition to the one that accords with the now altered state of his Church, and which in one respect is much more simple and easy of application ; and if he does so, and that because he is not, as many others of his Church are not, a believer in the propriety of the Pope's recent leap into the chair of infallibility (thus hoping to save himself, it may be, from the task of defending his Church from another instance of council decreeing against council, and pope against pope, instances of which so frequently occur in history), yet I must insist upon his adding to his definition those portions of the decree of the Council of Trent which he has left out of it. They are as follows. After a list of the books of Scripture, in which those of the Apocrypha are inserted, and after declaring the old and Vulgate edition, i.e., a Latin edition (and not the Hebrew and Greek originals), to be held as authentic in all public lectures, disputations, sermons, and expositions ; and that no one shall dare or presume to reject it, under any pretence whatever, the decree proceeds : " In order to restrain petulant minds, the council further decrees, in matters of faith and morals, and whatever relates to the maintenance of Christian doctrine, no one confiding in his own judgment shall dare to wrest the sacred Scriptures to his own sense of them, contrary

to that which hath been held and still is held by holy mother Church, whose right it is to judge of the true meaning and interpretation of Sacred Writ, *contrary to the unanimous consent of the Fathers*, even though such interpretation should never be published. If any disobey, let them be denounced by the ordinaries and punished according to law."

But here before we can proceed a step we have as important a use, and as urgent a call, for the exercise of the Pope's infallibility as any that can well be conceived. This you will admit, I am sure, when I tell you that there is no dogma which the Church of Rome considers essential as distinctive of her faith from Protestantism, *that has ever had the unanimous consent of the Fathers!* Let your "friend" try his hand and supply us with one, and I will venture to promise him a list of writers—and they no mean authorities in his Church—who have written *against* as well as *for* the sense which the Church now desires all to hold of it. We have had an instance of this in the recent adoption of the dogma, that infallibility rested in *the Pope*, and not in *the Pope and Council*, as heretofore was maintained by the great majority of the Church. We know that there were many who argued against the dogma as well as for it. A number still hold out; but will any sane mind imagine for a moment that those who have recently sent in their adhesion to that dogma, have done so because they were convinced that their arguments had been set aside by the rebutting ones of their opponents? They have yielded to save appearances, and that only; but then, if so, does the dogma of the Pope's infallibility rest upon "*the unanimous consent of the Fathers?*" No more than it does upon the concurrence of the patriarch of Constantinople.

On the subject of Transubstantiation, which was discussed and a settlement attempted at the Council of Trent, Dr. Edgar shows the same want of unanimity to exist. He says: "This statement of transubstantiation is couched in general terms, in which its patrons seem to hold the same faith. The doctrine, expressed in this manner, obtains the assent of every professor of Romanism. All these agree in principles, but in many respects differ in details. This agreement and difference appeared in a striking light at the celebrated Council of Trent.

"The doctors of that assembly wrangled on this topic in tedious and nonsensical jargon. An attempt was made, but in vain, to satisfy all in the composition of the canons. None were pleased. The dogma, in consequence, had, for the sake of peace, to be propounded in few words and general expressions; and this stratagem effected an ostensible unanimity. Paolo, an authority, refers to this as follows: 'Mais elles ne purent contenter personne, on résolut dans la congrégation générale d'user de moins de paroles qui serait possible dans l'exposition de la doctrine, et de se servir d'expressions si générales qu'elles pussent s'accommoder aux sentiments des deux partis.'

"The Dominicans and Franciscans differed at the Council of Trent, as they do still, on an essential point of this theory.

"A third party differ from the Dominicans and Franciscans. The substance of the bread and wine, in the theology of this faction, neither remains, as say the Franciscans, nor changes, according to the Dominicans, but ceases to exist either by annihilation, resolution or corruption. The substance of the sacramental elements is reduced to nothing; or by analysis or putrefaction, returns to its former

principles. This opinion, says Faber, was held by Henry, Cajetan, and many other abettors of Catholicism."

A fourth class differs from the preceding ones, led by Paris, Rupert, Ægidius, Durandus, Goffrid, Mirandula and Soto. To this a fifth class is given by Dr. Edgar, who differ from the others as they do one from the other. So much for the "unanimous consent of the Fathers."

Then we have, according to Dr. Edgar's cases, cited a wonderful exhibition of differences of opinion on the proper rendering of John vi., on which the doctrine of transubstantiation is said mainly to rest. Cardinal Cajetan and Pope Pius II. say this passage cannot refer to the communion, for it was not then instituted. The Cardinal is quite Protestant in his judgment on this passage, for he says "Our Lord *spoke of faith, as he had not yet appointed the sacrament.*" Augustine, Bonaventure, and Aquinas contend that these words (John vi., 50, 56) "signify spiritual eating by faith and love." Here is Protestantism for you in earnest. Surely your "friend" will not after this tell you, as he has done, that Protestantism is but three centuries old. But while this is Protestantism, what shall we say of these fathers and their opponents? Are they not a fine illustration of the *unanimity of the Fathers*? Nor less so of the correctness of your "friend's" statement: "We have the whole world for us during the fifteen centuries that preceded Luther."

But what shall we say of the infallibility as well as the unanimity of the Fathers of the Church of Rome, in the light of the following from Edgar? "Pascasius, in the ninth century, seems to have been the father of this deformity (transubstantiation), which he hatched in his melancholy cell. His claim to the honor and improvement of this paradox is admitted by Sirmond, Bellarmine and Bruys. 'Pascasius,' says Sirmond, 'was the first who, on this question, explained the genuine sense of the Church.' This Monk, according to Bellarmine, 'was the first who in an express and copious manner, wrote on the truth of the Lord's body and blood.' Men, says Mabillon, 'were, from reading his work, led to a more full and profound knowledge of the subject.' Bruys candidly confesses that transubstantiation was a discovery of the ninth century, and unknown in the darker ages of antiquity. Scotus acknowledges that transubstantiation was no article of faith before the Council of Lateran in 1215"!!!

Further, observes Edgar, "The Pascasian innovation was opposed by nearly all the piety and erudition of the age. A constellation of theologians rose in arms against the absurdity. Raban, Walafrid, Herebold, Rudentius, Florus, Scotus and Bertramn, the ablest theologians, arrayed themselves against the novelty." Here again we see anything rather than unanimity among the Fathers! What then, I again ask, about your "friend's" averment of *the whole world for fifteen centuries preceding Luther being with the Roman Church*?

I have given the above instances of opposing views upon the one doctrine—transubstantiation; but as much might be said of the communion in one kind, of extreme unction, of image worship, of purgatory, and of the celibacy of the clergy, &c., &c., &c.; but were we to go through the historical account of opposing councils and opposing popes, and the many and flagrant contradictions and oppositions of the one to the other, we would at once conclude that to talk of the Church of Rome being able to settle on its own authority a rule of faith, much

less to make such rest on tradition and the unanimous consent of the fathers, with that of inspired Scriptures, is not only the greatest piece of presumption, but the most striking exhibition of folly and arrant nonsense that it is possible to conceive of.

Elliott, in his *Delineations of Romanism*, has the following on that which constitutes the rule of faith in the Roman Church : " The Protestant rule is the Scripture. To the Scripture the Roman Catholic adds (1.), the Apocrypha ; (2.), traditions ; (3.), Acts and discussions of the Church, embracing numerous volumes of the Pope's Bulls ; ten folio volumes of Decretals ; thirty-one folio volumes of Acts of Councils ; fifty-one folio volumes of the *Acta-Sanctorum*, or the doings and sayings of the saints ; (4.) add to these at least thirty-five volumes of the Greek and Latin fathers, in which he says is to be found the *unanimous* consent of the fathers ; (5.), to all these one hundred and thirty-five volumes folio, add the chaos of *unwritten traditions* which have floated to us down from the apostolical times. But we must not stop here ; for the expositions of every priest and bishop must be added. The truth is, such a rule is no rule ; unless an endless and contradictory mass of uncertainties could be a rule. No Romanist can soberly *believe*, much less *learn*, his own rule of faith."—*p* 19.

Dr. Cumming, in his celebrated discussion with Mr. French, has wittily but truthfully said, " If you were to take one of the largest spring vans on the B. Railroad, it would not contain one-tenth of the Romanist rule of faith.

Now place by the side of this the Protestant rule, and how simple and satisfactory it is seen to be ! The Scriptures, containing in sufficiently simple language on all matters of faith and practice, a full and clear exposition of truth to be received, and a course of life in perfect accord with that system to be pursued. Having learned the principles of the faith to be believed, the disciple is then led by his teacher to apply its principles in the hope of receiving certain good which is of the greatest moment to his well-being through all the future of his existence. As taught to expect, he receives, as the fruit of his faith in the Lord Jesus Christ, a sense of the divine favor in the forgiveness of his sins. Hence, with the Prophet, he exclaims : " O Lord I will praise Thee ; though Thou wast angry with me, Thine anger is turned away, and Thou comfortedst me."—Isaiah XII. 1. Similar in import are Luke XXIV. 27 ; Acts II. 39 ; III. 19 ; XIII. 38, 39 ; Rom. V. 1 ; VIII. 1 ; Eph. II. 7 ; I. John II. 1. Then, with the above blessing he gets the Holy Spirit, so frequently and fully referred to by our Lord to His disciples : see Luke XI. 13 ; John IV. 10, 14 ; VII. 38, 39 ; XVI. 7 ; Acts II. 38 ; Rom. VII. 9, 10, 11, 14, 15, 16, &c., &c. ; I Cor. III. 16 ; VI. 19 ; 2 Cor. VI. 16, &c., &c.

Here we see is added to a knowledge of the theory, or principles of the salvation of God and the practice agreeing thereto, an experience which we are taught to believe ever flows from such. In what condition, then, is he who because of a clear and satisfactory sense of the forgiveness of his sins, and the renewal of his heart in righteousness not of man, but of the Holy Spirit of God—being " born not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, *nor of the will of man, but of God.*"—John I. 13. Or, as St. Peter has it (and he surely is an authority in the Church of Rome) : " Being born again, not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible, *by the Word of God*, which liveth and abideth forever."—Peter I. 23.

What but that of a happy and sweetly assured believer of the reality and power of the grace of God that has brought him salvation, and of the divinely attested character of those means which he had used so successfully thereto.

This experience is doubtless that inspiration to which your "friend" referred as constituting what he calls the second rule of faith as held by Methodists, &c., &c. Nor of this will Methodists feel ashamed, as it shows religion in common sense agreement with any of the proper professions of life in which men are moving; for whether a man study the profession of medicine or that of agriculture, or indeed any other science or profession, he has first the theory to master and learn; then, that theory to apply in practice; and then, as a consequence, certain results, by which he tests the correctness of his theory, or the method of its application he has followed. If the results are satisfactory, he will feel assured; nor will any one be able to shake his confidence in the conclusions he has reached. Inasmuch, therefore, as the grace of God in the Gospel of His Son is designed to be a remedy for sin, and when as such it is applied and effects follow which we were taught to look for and expect, then those effects speak for themselves, being just such as should arise in order to justify the claims of the Gospel upon our credence and respect. In this instance, therefore, as in the former, no power should be permitted to shake our confidence in the faith we profess, and in the application we were induced to make of its principles.

Ere I close this letter I will call your attention to a fact which your "friend" and his co-religionists seem not to have perceived. It is the clearly admitted custom or habit of the Jews, in our Lord's days, of reading and applying the Holy Scriptures as individuals or in communities. To this practice our Lord in several instances alludes, but never in the way of reproof, much less of condemnation. This is the more remarkable, as He many times reprehended them for things wrong in their creed and in their conduct; yet when they controverted His claims to be the Son of God, He simply pointed them to the Scriptures (which they held and which they read, and on which they exercised their private judgment), but only to lead them to a more consistent interpretation and use of their teachings.—John v. 39. Again, when He would correct the Sadducees of the error into which they had fallen on the subject of the resurrection, He remarks, "*Ye do err not knowing the Scriptures, nor the power of God.*" "But as touching the resurrection of the dead, *have ye not read* that which was spoken unto you by God, saying, &c."—Matt. xxii. 29-31. Then in another remarkable instance in the narrative of the rich man and Lazarus, he taught: "Abraham saith unto him, they have Moses and the prophets, let them hear them." . . . "If they hear not Moses and the prophets, neither will they be persuaded though one rose from the dead.—Matt. xvi. 29-31. Again, and still more striking, is the following: "And many other signs truly did Jesus in the presence of His disciples which are not written in this book; but these are written that ye might believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God; and that believing ye might have life through His name."—John xx. 30-31. And if any question remains on any mind, the following should settle it, and forever: "For whatsoever things were written aforetime were written for our learning, that we through patience and comfort of the Scriptures might have hope." Rom. xv. 4. "All Scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doc-

trine, for reproof, for correction, and for instruction in righteousness, that the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works." 2 Tim. III. 16, 17, and then, as applying it to the most difficult book to understand in the whole canon of Sacred Scripture—the Rev. or Apoc. I. 3, it is written : "Blessed is he that *readeth*, and they that *hear* the words of this prophecy, and keep those things which are written therein."

When, therefore, the import of these Scriptures is duly considered, and the usage of the Church during its Old Testament dispensation, throughout that of the Saviour's personal ministry on the earth and for several centuries subsequent to that time, to have been the free and personal use of these writings, and turn round and reflect upon the conduct and spirit of the Church of Rome, in forbidding their use to the people, punishing most severely those who dared to disobey them, and as with a horrid zeal denouncing them and destroying them where-soever they could lay hands upon them, we can have no hesitation in declaring such to be at once antichristian, and worthy of condemnation in the most emphatic manner.

The conduct of the Protestant is in pleasing contrast to all this. He is seen to be above all fear as to the most searching investigations into his faith and practice which the freest use of the Holy Scriptures might occasion ; ever saying, "To the law and to the testimony ; if they speak not according to this word, it is because there is no light in them." Isa. VIII. 20. Assured that "every one that doeth evil hateth the light, neither cometh to the light, lest his deeds should be reproved. But he that doeth truth cometh to the light, that his deeds may be made manifest, that they are wrought in the Lord." John III. 20, 21.

The subject shall be continued in my next.

Yours in the Lord,

JOHN BORLAND.

April, 1873.

LETTER III.

A TEST TO BE KEPT IN MIND—PRETENSIONS INVESTIGATED—SERIOUS DEPARTURES NOTED—ANTAGONISM PROVED—ASTONISHING ASSUMPTIONS SHOWN—THE PERIODS OF GREAT CHANGES GIVEN—JANUS—DELLINGER'S WORK QUOTED—IMPORTANT STATEMENTS—CONTRADICTIONS, HERESIES, &C., SHOWN—MANY NATIONAL CHURCHES MENTIONED WHICH NEVER HAD ANY CONNECTION WITH ROME—SCRIPTURES USUALLY APPLIED TO THE POPE SHOWN BY THE EXPOSITIONS OF THE FATHERS TO HAVE NO REFERENCE TO HIM.

MY DEAR L.,

Romanists are never tired in ringing the changes on the statements that their Church is the *first* Church, therefore the only *true* Church ; and connection with which by a reception of its faith, and submission to its pastorate and discipline, and a participation in its ordinances, is essential to salvation. And that in all

these their statements and assumptions, so your "friend" assures you, "they have the science of eighteen centuries" while "the Protestants have but that of three centuries!!!" and therefore it is "evident that there cannot be but one true faith, which has but one true sense, as there is but one Lord, one Baptism and one Revelation." Such statements they think should silence all opposition against them, yea, and bring all opponents to their knees as most humble suppliants for the forgiveness of their errors, and for speedy induction into their communion and privileges. And it need not be denied that in not a few instances the sophistry of these statements and the confidence with which they are iterated and reiterated have shaken certain untaught Protestants in their confidence, insomuch so that if not altogether willing to abandon their own faith, yet at least to look upon that of the Romanist as having more in its favor than they were wont to imagine. Of one thing, however, Protestants should be resolved, and that is, that while Romanism and Protestantism cannot both be true,—they being decidedly antagonistic in spirit and principle the one to the other—and while the means for determining the questions between them are so ample and available, they should fully and faithfully use those means for that end, so that under no circumstances could they be induced to abandon truth for error, however ancient that error may be, or however attractively attired and presented.

Another fact which should be ever kept in mind, is that religion, like every other business or science, has, as in my previous letter I have stated, a regular and unmistakable series of results, which when experienced supply a perfect demonstration of its presence and character. Thus, to this end our Lord speaks in the following words: *If any man will do his will, he shall know of the doctrine*, whether it be of God or whether I speak of myself." John vii. 17. "I am the light of the world; he that followeth me shall *not walk in darkness, but shall have the light of life*." John viii. 12. Hence, as he who sows a particular grain, reaps a harvest of the same and is satisfied, and that by evidence which none may gainsay, so he who has "sown to the spirit," and "of the spirit" is reaping a continuous flow of peace with God, and power over sin, (see Isa. lxxxiii. 17,) knows that he has hold not only of truth, but of *the* truth, because it saves him, and makes him joyously hopeful of the future.

Of the assertions of the Romanist, I say they are assumptions and nothing more. In proof of which we will examine some of them. They say they are the *first Church*, and therefore the *only true Church*. But how shall this be proved? How but by appealing to the writings which contain the doctrines and the conduct of the first and true Church. The Acts of the Apostles and St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans will suffice for this.

I may premise by saying that no Protestant denies but that the Church of Rome had a *name* and a *place* among the churches of apostolic times. But the questions are: Is she to-day what she then was? Does she maintain, in fundamentals at least, the faith and the usages of the primitive Churches? For if she has departed from these, then having so departed she has lost her status, and is in whole or in part a novelty and not the primitive Church founded by St. Paul and addressed by him in his memorable Epistle. (I say nothing of St. Peter as

connected with the Church of Rome ; for it recently has been demonstrated in an able discussion in Rome itself, what was long believed by many, that he never was in Rome, therefore never could have been its first Bishop or Pope ; and so all the chain fancifully linked on to this hook falls to the ground and is broken to pieces.)

A careful comparison of these books with the principles and doings of the priesthood of Rome will show a marked and striking difference between them and the primitive Churches. For instance, in those days a penitent seeker of mercy was directed *at once* to the Saviour in faith, as thus he would receive the forgiveness of his sins, the gift of the Holy Spirit and adoption into God's family, as see Acts II. 37, 38 ; XVI. 31 and Rom. III. 24, 26, &c., &c. In those instances we see *no confessional*, or any *use for it*, no insisting upon a *full* confession of sin, under the threat that if every sin was not confessed the whole service would be vitiated and rendered worse than null. No *pumping* by the Apostles to sound the depths of the heart and the history of the life, especially in all its wickedness ; no, nor do we see an instance in which the apostles assumed the authority *to forgive and absolve from sin*, although we may believe that they as fully and as accurately understood the import of Matthew XVIII. 18, and of John XX. 22 23, as do the priests of Rome to-day.

In their conduct we see the Protestant interpretation of these passages maintained, and nothing more ; viz., that they, the apostles, were authorized to declare on what terms or conditions God would *loosen* (forgive) sins, or under what circumstances He would *bind* them or hold the sinner under their obligations and penalties. In this way they preached and acted, as all may see ; but in this way the priests of Rome *do not act*, as every Romanist fully knows ; and, therefore, to that extent at least the conduct of the priest *is a novelty*, while that of the Protestant minister, which accords with the action of the Apostles, is primitive and apostolic, and therefore of the *first and only Church*.

Then as to baptism ; how was that administered by the Apostles ? I turn to the Acts of the Apostles, II. 41 ; VIII. 16 ; X. 48 ; and I see, according to our Lord's institution, water applied in the name of the Lord, and that called baptism. But I go to the Church of Rome, and there for baptism what a parade, and as well, a departure from the simple rite of the Apostles ! First there is Chrism, or oil mixed with water ; second, there is Exorcism, for driving the devil out of the child ; then salt is used, and the priest blows into the face of the child, and making the sign of the cross says, "Go out of him, Satan." Thirdly ; then the forehead, eyes, breast, &c., are crossed to show the mystery of baptism ; (query, is it not rather to show what power the priest has ?) the senses are opened to receive God, and to understand His commands. Fourthly, then some exorcised salt is put into the mouth, to signify a deliverance from the putrefaction of sin, and the savor of good works, the priest saying : "Take the salt of wisdom, and let it be a propitiation for thee to eternal life. Amen." Then the nose and ears are to be anointed with spittle, and the child brought to the water, as the blind man to Siloam, to signify it brings light to the mind. After baptism the priest anoints the top of the head with Chrism, and says, "Let Him anoint thee with the Chrism of salvation." A white garment put on the child, and a lighted candle put into

the hand, are also parts of this ceremony, according to the Church of Rome, and the whole called by it *Christian Baptism*! Add to this the fear with which they inspire their people because of the condition of the child until it is baptized—that were it to die before the priest had taken it through the ceremony it would never see heaven, but be shut up in *limbo*, a place of utter darkness, forever—and you have another instance of the great distance to which the Church of Rome has drifted away from the primitive Church; yes, and how much of *heathenish rubbish* she has thrown upon a simple and significant sacrament of the Christian dispensation!

The principal duty of the apostles was, as see Matt. XXVIII. 19, 20, and I. Cor. I. 17—to preach the Gospel and instruct people in all things which He, the Saviour, had commanded them; but the principal duty of the priests of Rome appears to be to celebrate mass, and to uphold the authority and dignity of the Church, which in these instances always means *the clergy*.

The celebration of the Eucharist, or the Lord's Supper, by the Apostles, as see I. Cor., XI. 23, 29, was to commemorate His death, in doing which they ate bread and drank wine together; the only mystery of which being that to the Christian's faith the broken bread represented the broken body of the Saviour, and the wine his shed blood. But what a novelty is the whole mass, transubstantiation, and its appendages, to the simple sacrament as observed by the Apostles! But with whom shall we say is oneness with the true and primitive Church? The Romanist priest with his ceremony of the mass and his assumption of transubstantiation, of which the Apostles and the Church until the twelfth century were ignorant, or the Protestant Church, which now to the letter follows the usage of the Apostles in every particular in this instance as in others? The veriest child can decide a question of this nature.

But perhaps in no instance is the Church of Rome seen at a distance from, yea, in actual antagonism to the true Church of Christ, than in her assumption of infallibility, and of the right to open or to shut heaven at her will; and with this to change by alteration or addition the terms or conditions of salvation. Here, truly, as according to the startling description of the Apostle Paul in 2. Thess., II. 4., is she seen: "Who opposeth and exalteth himself above all that is called God, or that is worshipped; so that he as God sitteth in the temple of God, showing himself that he is God." This, commencing in the changes in faith and practice which the clergy of Rome have from time to time effected, changes the *non*-observance of which involves the penalty of a *curse*, and the observance of which is essential, according to their teaching, to salvation; the suppression of the Word of God, and the entire submission to themselves which they demand, being a part—an important part—of them, and which have now culminated in the investiture of the Pope with *infallibility*! These together put the Church of the Romanist before us in an appalling light, and suggest to all thoughtful minds the most serious considerations and consequences.

Nor do these particulars complete the picture. The application made of them by the clergy of Rome conducts us to the startling conclusion that if they are right, then must God have placed the Gospel, with all its provision of blessings and judgments, and all its economy of conditions and services, fully and unreservedly

into their hands ; and in doing so has given them to understand that whom *they would save* shall be saved, and whom *they would not save, shall not be saved*. That in all this matter, interesting as was the process of providing salvation to Him, and thrilling as was the process and developments to angels, yet now God abandoned all to the good will and pleasure of any pope who filled the chair in Rome ; and even to any priest who chanted a mass or sat in a confessional. And, further, for deeper tints are needed to complete the picture, it mattered not how vile the pope or priest's character and life might be, how fully they might serve Satan in their life and honor him in their death ; yet when they habited themselves in their robes of office, and essayed the performance of its duties, they, *and they only*, should have the honor of dealing out salvation in any measure, to whomsoever and howsoever they pleased. And, further, they on whom they thundered God's judgments, no matter how good and consistent with the Word of God the lives of such were known to be, yet on them, in virtue of their priestly denunciations, the thunderbolt should fall, and their destruction should be as infallibly certain as that God lived and the Gospel was true.

On this assumption of investiture and monopoly the Romanist clergy act, referring to God only as and when it is necessary to give splendour to their office, or to enforce deference and submission to their will. Hence it is deeply affecting to see how perfectly every great and cardinal truth of Christianity is neutralized and denuded of any gracious and saving effect by these assumptions and actions of the Romanist priest. For instance : Is God admitted by him to be supreme in power and glory ? Yet he neutralizes that admission by assuming to himself the highest prerogatives of God, by pardoning sin ; by altering or modifying the conditions of salvation ; by suppressing God's own Word and the substituting that of his own ; by demanding to himself the most absolute submission, such as should be rendered only to God ; and by exacting constant dependence upon his influence for everything that is good and appertaining to salvation.

Does he speak of Christ as *the one* Mediator between God and man ? Then he destroys this confession by the addition of other mediators, as though Christ did not *possess all the qualities* essential for the right performance of so important a function of His mediatorial work. God says "*there is one God, and ONE Mediator*;" but the Romanist says virtually, "*there is one God, but MANY mediators between God and man*," &c. ; while in not a few instances the Virgin Mary is in this respect exalted above "*God her Saviour*" by the votaries of this novel system, called most erroneously—Christianity.

Do they speak of the sacrifice of the cross,—the death of Christ on Calvary for the sins of the world ? Yet they hold up the mass, an offering of the priests simply, and so manage as that their people are called to look, not on Calvary at what Christ did, but at the altar at what the priest in the mass now does, and here absurdities rich and ripe cluster, for in the mass is a sacrifice for the sins of men—and here only—and yet such is graduated in value not by the nature of the victim but either by the will of the priest, or more generally by the *purse* of the people, and so dependent is the value of the *mass* upon the purse, and the action of the priest upon the amount that is in it, that if what is there is not equal to the priest's demands the sufferer, whether on earth or in purgatory (a place of which the primitive

Church knew nothing), must suffer still, and still and still,—for without shedding of—what? of blood? no, without shedding of *money*, there is no redemption! But with plenty of money there is redemption for anybody!—even I suppose for a Judas. *Apropos* blood, Paul tells us that without shedding of blood there is no remission of sins: Heb. ix. 22, and that in the nature of vicarious sacrifice for sin there must be sufferings and death on the part of the sacrifice, see Heb. ix. 25, 28, yet what is there of these essential parts of a sacrifice in the mass? Nothing, absolutely nothing; hence while they are performing the mass and the people are worshipping and wondering, God is dishonored and insulted in the worship due to Him *being given to a piece of bread, said to be “turned into God” just then, and that by the word of a man!!!* The sacrifice of the cross, which being *once* accomplished, is never to be repeated, (see Heb. ix. 12, 26, 28, and x. 13.) But if Romanism be true, then the offering of the cross is and may be offered times without number. Thus Romanism *versus* the Apostles.

The usages of the primitive Church had nothing of this and its associate services of the Romanist's Church, and it were vain to attempt to seek in the New Testament anything like them in the practices of the Apostles. Yea, we have only to look through that book to be convinced that the Church of the Romanist has strayed far, far indeed from the Church of those days—a reason, doubtless good and sufficient, why a people unwilling either to reform their abuses or to abandon their assumptions, should strive by all means to prevent its circulation and study.

The following statement, taken from Farrar's Ecclesiastical Dictionary, will give you an idea of the changes in the Roman Church which have taken place at different periods in its history :—

“*The Pope Gregory* denounced the patriarch John of Constantinople, who in the year 594 assumed to himself the title of *Universal Bishop*, declaring such to be a *wicked and blasphemous title*. Yet his successor to the See of Rome—Boniface III.—accepted the title which has since been held by his successors—although originally bestowed by the vile tyrant Phocas, as a reward to the Roman Bishop for his recognition as Emperor in the throne he had usurped. One bishop of Rome accepts the title from the hand of the Roman Emperor, while a preceding bishop, Gregory the Great, declared that he who should assume it would prove himself to be *Antichrist*. Baronius, the Romanist Cardinal and historian, says: Baron. A. D. 606: “Phocas being incensed against Cerideus, Bishop of Constantinople, who had assumed the title, granted the title *Sovereign Pontiff* to the Roman Bishop.”

“Invocation first taught with authority by a Council of Constantinople, A.D. 754.

“Use of images and relics in religious worship first publicly affirmed and sanctioned in the Council of Nicæa, A. D. 787.

“Compulsory celibacy of the clergy first enjoined publicly at the first Council of Lateran, A. D. 1123.

“Papal supremacy first publicly asserted and confirmed by the fourth Council of Lateran, A. D. 1215.

“Auricular confession first enjoined by Innocent III. at the fourth Council of Lateran, A. D. 1215.

"Prayers in a foreign tongue first deliberately sanctioned by the Council of Trent, A. D. 1562.

"Transubstantiation was first publicly insisted on by the fourth Council of Lateran, A. D. 1215.

"Purgatory and indulgences first set forth by the Council of Florence, A. D. 1438.

"Judicial Absolution authorized by the Council of Trent, A. D. 1551.

"Apocrypha received as canonical at the Council of Trent, A. D. 1547.

"The number of the sacraments first settled by the Council of Trent, A.D. 1545." The number of Articles added at this Council, the belief and reception of which is essential to be saved from the Church's curses, is *twelve*. Since then, has been added the dogma of the Immaculate Conception, and latterly, as you will recollect, that of the Infallibility of the Pope. How many more changes shall yet be brought about, no person can tell. But certainly each of the articles enumerated, inasmuch as they are declared to be essential to salvation, is a radical change, and the Church that has passed through these and so many of them, has long since ceased to be what she once was, the Church which the Apostle Paul planted in Rome.

To show you still further, the utter lack of truth in the statement of your "friend"—and which statement is made with confidence of its supposed truthfulness by many others beside him—"We have the whole world for us during the fifteen centuries that preceded Luther"—I will quote from "Janus," a work of the justly celebrated Döllinger, who when he wrote it was a high dignitary and authority in the Catholic Church. He distinguishes, I should say with great force and clearness between the *Catholic* and the *Papal* Church. The latter he says, has *by the ambition of popes, and the intrigues of Jesuits, separated far from true Catholicism and as he remarks has gone on from one step to another in a downward course until it has resolved upon its last and crowning absurdity, the Infallibility of the Pope.*" Against this he lifts as a true Catholic, his warning voice, and "Janus" contains that warning and the reasons for enforcing it; showing as he does the steps in the downward course taken, he remarks: "It was St. Jerome's reproach to the Pelagians that according to their theory, God had, as it were, wound up a watch once for all, and then gone to sleep because there was nothing for Him more to do. Here we have the Jesuit supplement to this view. God has gone to sleep because in His place His ever wakeful and infallible Vicar on earth rules, as Lord of the world and dispenser of grace and punishment. St. Paul's saying 'In Him we live, and move, and are,' is transferred to the Pope. Few even of the Italian canonists of the fifteenth century could screw themselves up to this point. * * * We owe it to Bellarmine and other Jesuits that in some documents the Pope is expressly designated *Vice-God*! The *Civiltà*, too, after asserting that all the treasures of divine revelation, of truth, righteousness, and the gifts of God are in the Pope's hand, who is their sole dispenser and guardian, comes to the conclusion that the Pope carries on Christ's work on earth, and is in relation to us what Christ would be if He was still visibly present to rule His Church. It is but one step from this to declare the Pope an incarnation of God." The translator of Döllinger has a note here worthy of insertion.

"Compare this with Pusey's Eirenicon, p. 327. One recently returned from Rome had the impression that some of the extreme Ultramontanes, if they do not say so in so many words, imply a quasi-hypostatic union of the Holy Ghost with each successive Pope! The accurate writer who reported this to me observed in answer, 'This seems to me to be Llamaism!!!'"

"Ultramontanism then, is essentially Papalism and its starting-point is that the Pope is infallible in all doctrinal decisions, not only on matters of faith, but in the domain of ethics, on the relations of religion to society, of Church to State, and even on State institutions, and that every such decision claims unlimited and unreserved submission in word and deed from all Catholics." pp. 39, 40. "Rome on her part omits no means of confirming the whole Catholic world in this clerico-Italian manner of thinking and feeling." p. 44.

In showing the inconsistency of attempting to prove the dogma of Papal Infallibility from Church history, "nothing less is required," he says, "than a complete falsification" of history. "The declarations of Popes which contradict the doctrines of the Church, or contradict each other (as the same Pope sometimes contradicts himself), will have to be twisted into agreement, so as to show that their heterodox or mutually destructive enunciations are at the bottom sound doctrine, or when a little has been subtracted from one dictum and added to the other, are not really contradictory and mean the same thing." pp. 49, 50.

"Innocent I. and Gelasius I., the former writing to the Council of Melvis, the latter in his epistle to the Bishops of Picenum, declared it to be so indispensable for infants to receive communion, that those who die without it go straight to hell. A thousand years later the Council of Trent anathematized this doctrine." p. 51. "In 769, when Constantine II., who had got possession of the Papal Chair by force of arms, and kept it for thirteen months, was blinded and deposed at a Synod, and all his ordinations pronounced invalid." p. 52.

"But the strongest case occurred at the end of the ninth century, after the death of Pope Formosus, when the repeated rejection of ordinations threw the whole Italian Church into the greatest confusion, and produced a general uncertainty as to whether there were any valid sacraments in Italy. Auxilius, who was a contemporary, said that through this universal rejection and repetition of orders matters had come to such a pass in Rome, that for twenty years the *Christian religion had been interrupted and extinguished in Italy*. Popes and Synods decided in glaring contradiction to one another, now for, now against, the validity of the ordinations, and it was self-evident that in Rome all sure knowledge on the doctrine of ordination was lost." p. 5.

"Celestine III. tried to loosen the marriage tie by declaring it dissolved if either party became heretical. Innocent III. annulled this decision. Hadrian VI. called Celestine a heretic for giving it." (pp. 54 55.) Wonderful agreement in the infallibles of an infallible Church truly!

"And thus the perplexing spectacle was afforded the church of one pope unequivocally charging another with false doctrine. What Nicolas III. and Clement V. had solemnly commended as right and holy, their successor branded as solemnly as noxious and wrong. The Franciscans repeated the charge of heresy against John XXII., with the more emphasis, 'since what the popes had once defined in

faith and morals, through the keys of wisdom, their successors could not call in question.' *p.* 59.

"After the papal claim to infallibility had taken a more definite shape at Rome, Sixtus V. himself brought it again into jeopardy by his edition of the Bible. The Council of Trent had pronounced St. Jerome's version authentic for the Western Church ; but there was no authentic edition of the Latin Bible sanctioned by the Church. Sixtus V. undertook to provide one, which appeared garnished with the stereotyped forms of anathema and penal enactments. His bull declared that this edition, corrected by his own hand, must be received and used by everybody as the only true and genuine one, under pain of excommunication ; every change, even of a single word, being forbidden under anathema.

"But it soon appeared that it was full of blunders, some two thousand of them introduced by the Pope himself !" It was said the Bible of Sixtus V. must be publicly prohibited. But Bellarmine advised that the peril Sixtus V. had brought the Church into should be hushed up as far as possible ; all the copies were to be called in, and the corrected Bible printed anew, under the name of Sixtus V., *with a statement in the preface that the errors had crept in through the fault of the compositors and the carelessness of others.* Bellarmine himself was commissioned to give circulation to these lies, to which the new Pope gave his name by composing the preface. * * * And now followed a fresh mishap. The autobiography, which was kept in the archives of the Roman Jesuits, got known in Rome through several transcripts. On this Cardinal Azzolini urged that, as Bellarmine had insulted three popes, and exhibited *two as liars*, viz., Gregory XIV. and Clement VIII., his work should be suppressed and burnt, and the strictest secrecy inculcated about it." (*pp.* 62, 63). In a note at the bottom of the page is the following : "For, thought Azzolini, what shall we say if our adversaries infer the Pope can err in expounding Scripture—nay, hath erred, not only in expounding it, but in making many wrong changes in the text !"

VERDICT OF HISTORY.

"Some explanation is imperatively needed of the strange phenomenon that an opinion according to which Christ has made the Pope of the day the one vehicle of His inspirations, the pillar and exclusive organ of Divine truth, without whom the Church is like a body without a soul, deprived of the power of vision, and unable to determine any point of faith—that such an opinion, which is for the future to be a sort of dogmatic atlas carrying the whole edifice of faith and morals on its shoulders, should have first been certainly ascertained in the year of grace 1869, but is from henceforth to be placed as a primary article of faith at the head of every catechism.

"For thirteen centuries an incomprehensible silence on this fundamental article reigned throughout the whole Church and her literature. None of the ancient confessions of faith, no catechism, none of the patristic writings composed for the instruction of the people, contain a syllable about a Pope, still less any hint that all certainty of faith and doctrine depends on him. For the first thousand years of Church history not a question of doctrine was finally decided by him." *pp.* 63 64. "In the Arian disputes, which engaged and disturbed the

Church beyond all others for above half a century, and were discussed in more than fifty synods, the Roman See for a long time remained passive. Through the long episcopate of Pope Sylvester (314-335) there is no document or sign of doctrinal activities, any more than from all his predecessors from 269 to 314. Julius and Liberius (337-366) were the first to take part in the course of events, but they only increased the uncertainty. Julius pronounced Marcellus of Ancyra, an avowed Sabellian, orthodox at his Roman Synod, and Liberius purchased his return from exile from the Emperor by condemning Athanasius and subscribing an Arian creed. 'Anathema to thee, Liberius!' was then the cry of zealous Catholic bishops like Hilary of Poitiers. This apostasy of Liberius sufficed, through the whole of the middle ages, for a proof that popes could fall into heresy as well as other people." *pp. 67, 68.*

"A new chapter in the dogmatic action of the popes opens with the year 430, which was the starting-point of the controversies on the Incarnation and the relation of the two natures in Christ, which lasted on to the close of the seventh century. Pope Celestine's condemnation of Nestorius was superseded by the Emperor's convoking a general Council at Ephesus in 431, where it was submitted to examination, and approved." *p. 71.* This is a remarkable example of the Church's unity, orthodoxy and submission to the Pope. Emperors in those days seemed to have had a habit of popeing the Pope, and the popes could make the will of the Emperor answer for them in the place of the will of God.

Another instance of the pope's heresy and subserviency, and of the Emperor's supremacy and orthodoxy, is given as follows: "The Monotholite controversy, growing out of the assertion that Christ had two wills, a human and a Divine, but one Divine will only, led to the General Synod of Constantinople in 680. At the beginning of the controversy Pope Honorius I., when questioned by three patriarchs, had spoken entirely in favor of the heretical doctrine in letters addressed to them, and had hereby powerfully aided the new sect. Later on, in 649, Pope Martin, with a Synod of 105 bishops from Southern and Central Italy, condemned Monotholism. But the sentence of the Pope and a small Synod had no binding authority then, and the Emperor Constantine found it necessary to summon a General Council to settle the question. It was foreseen that Pope Honorius I., who had hitherto been protected by silence, must share the fate of the other chief authors of the heresy at this Council. He was, in fact, condemned for heresy in the most solemn manner, and not a single voice, not even that of the papal legates who were present, was raised in his defence. His dogmatic writings were committed to the flames as heretical. The popes submitted to the inevitable, they subscribed the anathema, and themselves undertook to see that the *heretic* Honorius was condemned in the west as well as throughout the east, and his name struck out of the Liturgy." *pp. 73, 74.*

"Nobody thought of getting dispensations from Church laws from the Roman bishops, nor was a single tax or tribute paid to the Roman See, for no court as yet existed." (The fifth century) "To make laws which could be dispensed for money would have appeared both a folly and a crime. The power of the keys, or of binding and loosing, was universally held to belong to the other bishops just as

much as to the bishop of Rome." *p. 81.* "For a long time nothing was known in Rome of definite rights bequeathed by Peter to his successors."—*Ibid.*

He further remarks, and this is important as bearing upon certain loud pretensions such as your "friend" and his co-religionists are wont to make: "There are many national Churches which were never under Rome, and never even had any intercourse by letter with Rome, without this being considered a defect, or causing any difficulty about Church communion. Such an autonomous Church, always independent of Rome, was the most ancient of those founded beyond the limits of the empire, the Armenian, wherein the primatial dignity descended for a long time in the family of the national apostle, Gregory the Illuminator. The great Syro-Persian Church in Mesopotamia, and the western part of the kingdom of the Sassanide, with its thousands of martyrs, was from the first, and always remained, equally free from any influence of Rome. In its records and its rich literature we find no trace of the arm of Rome having reached there. The same holds good of the Ethiopian or Abyssinian Church, which was indeed united to the See of Alexandria, but wherein nothing, except perhaps a distant echo, was heard of the claims of Rome. In the west, the Irish and the ancient British Church remained for centuries autonomous, and under no sort of influence of Rome." *pp. 84, 85.*

"There is another fact the infallibilist will find it impossible to explain." And to this your "friend's" attention is particularly called. "We have a copious literature on the Christian sects and heresies of the first six centuries. Irenæus, Hippolytus, Epiphanius, Philastrius, St. Augustine, and later, Leontius and Timotheus, have left us accounts of them to the number of eighty; but not a single one is reproached with rejecting the Pope's authority in matters of faith, while Aërius, *c. g.*, is reproached with denying the episcopate as a grade of the hierarchy. Had the *mot d'ordre* been given for centuries to observe a dead silence on this, in the Ultramontane view, *articulus stantis vel cadentis Ecclesia?*

"All this is intelligible enough if we look at the patristic interpretation of the words of Christ to St. Peter. Of all the fathers who interpret these passages in the Gospels (Matt. xvi. 18, John xxi. 17.), *not a single one applies them to the Roman bishops as Peter's successors!* How many fathers have busied themselves with these texts, yet not one of them whose commentaries we possess, Origen, Chrysostom, Hilary, Augustine, Cyril, Theodoret, and those whose interpretations are collected in Catenas, has dropped the faintest hint that the primacy of Rome is the consequence of the commission and promise of Peter! Not one of them has explained the rock of foundation on which Christ would build His Church of the office given to Peter to be transmitted to his successors, but they understood by it either Christ Himself or Peter's confession of faith in Christ; often both together. Or else they thought Peter was the foundation equally with all the other apostles, the twelve being together the foundation-stones of the Church. (Apoc. xxi. 14.) The fathers could the less recognize in the power of the keys, and the power of binding and loosing, any special prerogative or lordship of the Roman bishop, inasmuch as what is obvious to any one at first sight, they did not regard a power first given to Peter, and afterwards conferred in precisely the same words on all the Apostles, as anything peculiar to him, or heredi-

tary in the line of Roman bishops, and they held the symbol of the keys as meaning just the same as the figurative expression of binding and loosing.

“Every one knows the one classical passage of Scripture on which the edifice of Papal Infallibility has been reared: “I have prayed for thee, that thy faith fail not; and when thou art converted, confirm thy brethren.” (Luke XXII. 32. But these words manifestly refer only to Peter personally, to his denial of Christ, and his conversion; he is told that he, whose failure of faith would be only of short duration, is to strengthen the other Apostles, whose faith would likewise waver.” pp. 92 93. “Now, the Tridentine profession of faith, imposed on the clergy since Pius IV., contains a vow never to interpret Holy Scriptures otherwise than in accord with the unanimous consent of the fathers—that is, the great Church doctors of the first six centuries; for Gregory the Great, who died in 604, was the last of the fathers; *every bishop and theologian, therefore, breaks his oath when he interprets the passage in question of a gift of infallibility promised by Christ to the popes.*” pp. 93 94. This is to the point, and applies equally against the application of *Universality to the See of Rome*; for against this the same Gregory lifted up an earnest protest, declaring him *Antichrist* who should assume it.

Yours in the Lord,

JOHN BORLAND.

LETTER IV.

EXTRACTS IN FORMER LETTER—REASONS FOR—WHAT THEY WERE—A TEST OF FAITH—EXTRACTS FROM DR. EDGAR'S WORK—FEARFUL CONDITION OF THE CHURCH OF ROME SHOWN—OF CERTAIN POPES—HOW ELECTED—THEODORA AND MAROZIA—POPE JOHN XII.—BONIFACE VII.—GREGORY VII.—BONIFACE VIII.—JOHN XXIII.—ALEXANDER VI.—ERRORS IN DOCTRINE AND MORALS DISQUALIFY FOR GOD'S SERVICE—JUDAS AN EXAMPLE—DAMAGING TO CERTAIN PRETENSIONS—INFALLIBILITY A PREPOSTEROUS ASSUMPTION—SCRIPTURAL TESTS—APOSTOLICAL SUCCESSION AS HELD BY ROMANISTS, &C., A FIGMENT—THE TRUE APOSTOLICAL SUCCESSION EXPLAINED AND DEFENDED.

MY DEAR L—

In my last letter I gave you lengthy extracts from “Janus,” a work by the learned Dœllinger, to disprove the statements of your “friend” when he said that his “Church enjoyed unbroken testimony in her favor for the fifteen centuries preceding Luther”—a statement which Romanists are free and bold to make, evidently unaware of the abundant material at hand to fully disprove it. I chose my extracts from that book not because none others were at hand that could be employed for such a purpose, but because Dr. Dœllinger is yet alive, and is still *a Catholic*, although not, as he says, *a Papalist*; and continues to be regarded, as heretofore he has always been, as a man of unblemished reputation and of highest attainments as a scholar and professor.

By him it is seen—and my quotations might have been greatly extended—that popes have erred so as to have been denounced as heretics ; that councils and popes have contradicted each other with great distinctness and emphasis of deliverance ; that feuds have arisen from such differences and contradictions of the most scandalizing character ; that emperors have acted the part of popes, and in not a few instances with more dignity and truthful consistency than the popes themselves. That the title of “Universal Bishop,” (in which the Pope of Rome now flaunts his authority over the world—yea, over the three worlds ; heaven, earth, and hell ; or, as I should have said, the *four worlds* ; for was not purgatory discovered, not by Columbus, but by Agostino Trionfo of Ancona, an Augustinian monk—see Doellinger’s “Janus” *p.* 230)—was given him not by Christ, the Head of the Church, but by Phocas, the Roman Emperor, and one of the worst that ever disgraced the purple. That the assumption of the title was in direct opposition to the protest of a preceding pope (Gregory the Great), and as such not having “the unanimous consent of the fathers,” but rather in direct opposition to them, was clear and palpable *heresy*, according to a decree of the Council of Trent ; and, further, was a mark of “*Antichrist*,” according to his infallible holiness the aforesaid Gregory. And with all this, and much more that remains to be said, what do we see when we look at the Romanist Church if it be not a strange medley of inconsistencies and contradictions, of high assumptions and of grovelling passions ? And here you might well ask your “friend” how we shall estimate his boasted rule of faith, that in his estimation has done such wonders for his Church, but which, according to the teachings of history, has made her such a shifting, changing and worldly thing that we look in vain to find in her any of those pure, unselfish, spiritual and heavenly characteristics so distinctive of the Church that Christ and His Apostles planted and reared. And yet your “friend,” I doubt not, despite all that has been proved against her, will lift up his voice and shout, “Our Church is the true Church, in which is found catholicity, apostolicity, unity and inerrability, and I know not what, to sustain her in her claims for universal recognition and submission.”

A very superficial acquaintance with the Holy Scriptures is all that is necessary to establish the following : that faith, and every other means presented to man for his employment, have clear and unmistakable reference to the renewal of his mind *in holiness and righteousness* (Luke I, 75) ; for says St Paul to Timothy—see Ep. I : 5.—“Now the end of the commandment is charity (or love) out of a pure heart,” in other words, to make him like Christ in spirit and life, that he might be fitted to be with Christ in death. In doing this the process is to save, consciously, from the guilt and power of sin ; to endow with the spirit of adoption into the family of God ; and to qualify, by a change of heart, for so high a position that now by all such, the will of God may be done on earth as it is done in heaven. But when men are seen to be wicked : when they “drink iniquity like water,” it is vain for them to *talk of faith*, of holding *the true faith*, or of being members, much less ministers, of the true Church, for all such is based in error,—serious and palpable errors—which no man could fall into who consulted the Holy Scriptures with a design to be guided thereby.

A man may hold a correct faith so far as its theory is concerned, yet, he is

in scriptural teaching an unbeliever, and void of true faith, and therefore not a member of Christ's mystical body, the Church, unless his faith is of that practical and influential character which having its seat in the heart works through and in his life. For *faith, working by love* (Gal. V. 6) and *purifying the heart* (Acts XV. 9) is the rule and doctrine of God's Word. With this principle of judging the character and reality of faith, and in furtherance of my object, I will now call your attention to other facts as given by Dr. Edgar in his great work.

"The flood-gates of moral pollution," which it appears from the annalists had been steadily increasing in volume and power, "appear in the tenth century to have been set wide open, and inundations of all impurity poured on the Christian world through the channel of the Roman hierarchy. Awful and melancholy indeed is the picture of the popedom at this era drawn as it has been, by its warmest friends; such as Platina, Petavius, Luitprand, Genebrard, Baronius, Hermann Barday, Binius, Giannone, Vignier, L'Abbé, and Du Pin. Platina calls these pontiffs, monsters. Fifty popes, says Genebrard, in 150 years, from John the Eighth till Leo the Ninth, entirely degenerated from the sanctity of their ancestors, and were apostatical rather than apostolical. Thirty pontiffs resigned in the tenth century; and the successor, in each instance, seemed demoralized even beyond his predecessor. Baronius, in his annals of the tenth century, seems to labour for language to express the base degeneracy of the popes and the frightful deformity of the popedom. Many shocking monsters, says the annalist, intruded into the Pontifical Chair, who were guilty of robbery, assassination, simony, dissipation, tyranny, sacrilege, perjury, and all kinds of miscreancy, candidates destitute of every requisite qualification were promoted to the papal chair, while all the canons and traditions of antiquity were contemned and outraged."

"The Church," says Giannone, "was then in a shocking disorder—in a chaos of iniquity." "Some," says Barclay, "crept into the popedom by stealth, while others broke in by violence, and defiled the holy chair with the filthiest immorality. (*L'Église étoit plongée dans un chaos d'impûétés. An Eccl. 344* Giannone.)

"The electors and the elected, during this period, appear, as might be expected, to have been kindred spirits. The electors were neither the clergy nor the people, but two courtesans, Theodora and Marozia, mother and daughter, women distinguished by their beauty, and at the same time, though of senatorial family, notorious for their prostitution. These polluted patrons of licentiousness, according to their pleasure, passion, whim, or caprice, elected popes, collated bishops, disposed of dioceses, and indeed assumed, in a great measure, the whole administration of the Church. The Roman See, become the prey of avarice and ambition, was given to the highest bidder. (*Le siège de Rome étoit donné au plus offerant.*" Giannone, VII. 5. *An. Eccl. 345.*)

"These vile harlots, according to folly or fancy, obtruded their filthy gallants or spurious offspring on the pontifical throne. Theodora, having conceived a violent but base passion for John the Tenth, raised her gallant to the papacy. The Pontiff, like his patron, was an example of sensuality, and was afterwards in 924, at the instigation of Marozia, deposed, and, in all probability, strangled by Wido, Marquis of Tuscany. Marozia was mistress to Sergius the

Third, who treated the dead body of Formosus with such indignity. She brought her pontifical paramour a son, and this hopeful scion of illegitimacy and the popedom was, by his precious mother, promoted to the vicegerency of heaven. His conduct was worthy of his genealogy. He was thrown, however, into prison by Alberic, Marozia's son by Adelbert, where he died of grief, or as some say by assassination." Spon. 929, I. et 933 I.; Giannone, VII. 5, 6; Luitprand, II. 13; Petavius, I. 418. "*L'infâme Theodore fit élire pour Pape, le plus déclaré de ses amans, qui fut appelé Jean X. Baronius écrit qu'alors Rome était sans Pape.*" An. Eccl. 345."

John XII. ascended the papal throne in 955, in the eighteenth year of his age. His youthful days were characterized by barbarity and pollution. He surpassed all his predecessors, says Platina, in debauchery. His holiness, in a Roman synod, before Otho the Great, was found guilty of blasphemy, perjury, profanation, impiety, simony, sacrilege, adultery, incest, constupration, and murder." The particulars given by the annalist, are almost too atrocious for publication. "He was deposed by the Roman Council. But he afterwards regained the Holy See, and being caught in adultery, was killed, says Luitprand, by the devil, or more probably by the injured husband." "John, says Bellarmine, *was nearly the wickedest of the Popes.* Some of the Vice-Gods, therefore, the Cardinal suggests, surpassed his holiness in miscreancy."

"Boniface the Seventh, who seized the papal chair in 974, murdered his predecessor and successor. Historians represent him as 'the basest and wickedest of mankind.' Baronius calls him a thief, a miscreant, and a murderer, who is to be reckoned, not among the Roman pontiffs, but among the notorious robbers of the age. Gerbert and Vignier characterize him as a monster, who surpassed all mankind in miscreancy."

"Gregory VII. who obtained the papacy in 1073, was another pontifical patron of iniquity. The Cardinal Beno in sketching his character represents him as having gained the pontifical dignity by simony, and stained it by assassination and adultery. The Council of Worm and Brescia preferred numerous imputations against him, viz., usurpation, simony, apostasy, treason, schism, heresy, chicanery, dissimulation, fornication, adultery, and perjury. His holiness in the sentence of the German prelacy, preferred harlots to women of character and adultery and incest to chaste and holy matrimony." Labb. 12, 417; Copart, 2, 11, 48; Bruy, 2, 473.

"Boniface the VIII. was chosen Pope 1294. His character was placed in a striking light by Nogaret and Du Plessis. The Pontiff had offended Philip the Fair, King of France, by his bulls of deposition issued against that monarch. His Majesty, in consequence, called two conventions of three estates of the French nation. Nogaret and Du Plessis in these meetings accused Boniface of usurpation, simony, ambition, avarice, church-robbery, extortion, tyranny, impiety, abomination, blasphemy, heresy, infidelity, murder, and the sin for which Sodom was consumed. His infallibility represented the Gospel as a medley of truth and falsehood, and denied the doctrine of transubstantiation, the Trinity, the Incarnation, and the immortality of the soul. The soul of man, he affirmed, was 'the same as a beast's, and he believed no more in the Virgin Mary than in an ass, nor in her

Son than in the foal of an ass.' 'Les hommes ont les mêmes âmes que les bêtes, et l'Evangile enseigne plusieurs vérités et plusieurs mensonges. La doctrine de la Trinité est fausse ; l'enfantement d'une vierge est impossible ; l'incarnation du Fils de Dieu ridicule aussi bien que la transsubstantiation. Je ne crois pas plus en elle qu'en une ânesse, ni à son Fils qu'au poulain d'une ânesse.'" Bruy, 3, 346 ; Du Pin, 529 ; Alex. 22, 319, 327 ; Boss. 1. 278.

"These accusations were not mere hearsay, but supported on authentic and unquestionable evidence. Fourteen witnesses, men of credibility, deposed to their truth. Nogaret and Du Plessis offered to prove all these allegations before a general council." "He entered the papacy, it has been said, like a fox, reigned like a lion, and died like a dog ; for he died gnawing his fingers, and knocking his head against the wall like one in desperation."

"John XXIII. seems, if possible, to have exceeded all his predecessors in enormity. This pontiff moved in an extensive field of action, and discovered, during his whole career, the deepest depravity. The atrocity of his life was ascertained and published by the general Council of Constance after a tedious trial and examination of many witnesses. Thirty-seven were examined on only one part of the imputations. Many of these were bishops and doctors in law and theology, and all were men of probity and intelligence. His holiness, therefore, was convicted on the best authority, and indeed confessed his own criminality.

"The allegations against him were twofold. One respected faith and the other morality. On the former he was convicted of schism, heresy, deism, infidelity, heathenism, and profanity. He fostered schism by refusing to resign the popedom for the sake of unity. He rejected all the truths of the Gospel and all the doctrines of Christianity. He denied the immortality of the soul, the resurrection of the body, and the responsibility of man. He disregarded all the institutions of revealed religion.

"The other imputations on morality were seventy, twenty of which were suppressed for the honor of the Apostolic See. 'John,' says L'Abbé, 'was convicted of forty crimes. The Constantian fathers found him guilty among other crimes of piracy, robbery, murder, perjury, fornication, adultery, incest, constupration and sodomy, and characterized his supremacy as the oppressor of the poor, the persecutor of the just, the pillar of iniquity, the column of simony, the slave of sensuality, the alien of virtue, the dregs of apostacy, the inventor of malevolence, the mirror of infamy, and, to finish the climax, an incarnated devil.' 'The accusation,' says Nien, 'contained all mortal sins and an infinity of abominations.'

"Alexander VI. in the common opinion, surpassed all his predecessors in atrocity. This monster, whom humanity disowns, seems to have excelled all his rivals in the arena of villany, and outstripped every competitor in the stadium of miscreancy. Sannazarius compared him to Nero, Caligula, and Heliogabalus ; and Pope (a Romanist let it be remembered) in his celebrated 'Essay on Man,' likened Borgia, his family name, to Cataline. His debauchery, perfidy, ambition, malice, inhumanity, and irreligion, says Daniel, made him the execration of all Europe. Rome under his administration and by his example, became the sink of filthiness, the headquarters of atrocity, and the hotbed of prostitution, murder,

and robbery. "Les débordemens publics, les perfidies, l'ambition démesurée, l'avarice insatiable, la cruauté, l'irréligion en avoient fait l'objet de l'exécration de toute l'Europe."—Daniel, 7.84.

Some idea may be formed of his excesses when it is stated that the infamously celebrated Lucretia was at once his *daughter*, his *wife* and his *daughter-in-law*. "He murdered the majority of the cardinals who raised him to the popedom, and seized their estates. He had a family of spurious sons and daughters and for whose aggrandizement he exposed to sale all things sacred and profane, and violated and outraged all laws of God and man. His death was from poison which he had prepared for certain rich cardinals whose estates he had purposed to seize."

The above extracts are taken from Dr. Edgar's work, already referred to. They could be extended to any length, not only from his work but from others which abound on this and kindred subjects. And be it remembered that Dr. Edgar's book contains quotations from at least *one hundred and fifty Romanist writers of unquestionable authority*.

The instances of doctrinal error and fearful immoralities given are supplied to show : First, that the idea of *papal* infallibility, whether referring to the pope, or to the pope in council, or in whatever method the Church of Rome chooses to settle it, is a figment, worthless and absurd, and which no sane mind would utter that was not blinded by presumption, or that did not imagine the world strangely oblivious of the testimony of history. Second, that the Romanist's "rule of faith" is seen to be both from its nature and its results, just as impracticable as it is unprofitable ; and that for all good and useful purposes it might as well have never been propounded. And third, that if it is essential to salvation—and the Church of Rome says it is—that we should believe, first, that the Church of Rome in its pope and council and concurring clergy ; or, secondly, now in the Pope alone, is intallible ; or, in other words every one who will not believe that white is black, and that a lie is the truth, should make up his mind to sail for purgatory or some worse place ; and be satisfied to allow all the *noodles and things*, in the shape of rational beings, who will say and believe whatever is told them, however contradicted by facts and figures, by reason and common sense, to go together to the pope's paradise, and sing of a salvation, not to God and the Lamb, but to the pope and his clergy, to whom God had long ago abandoned His power to save and His will to bless ! ! !

Then as the Church of Rome is seen to have been wrong, fearfully and unmistakably wrong, in the past, may she not be wrong in certain instances in the present ? And is not such a strong and sufficient reason why each one should take a Bible and prayerfully read it for himself ? In this course he should resolve to act :

1. Because the Bible was given by God for this very purpose.
2. Because, while Protestants have followed this plan, they neither have, nor have had, so many and reprehensible differences and conflicts among them as have been, and are now, among the Romanists, and
3. Because that while the Roman Church supplies nothing that can be properly considered a rule of faith nothing but a blind and unreasoning, and

therefore an unmanly, submission to men proved to be *fallible and unreliable*, and because the Protestant *Rule of Faith* is both practicable and safe, and upon all fundamental particulars when properly used *inerrable*, it should be adopted by all persons, with an earnest purpose of seeking aid from Him who has promised "wisdom to all who ask," see James 1. 5 ; as then having "an unction from the Holy One" (the Holy Spirit) they "shall know all things,"—(all things essential to salvation, 1 John 2, 20.). and then practicing those truths in a sincere and believing spirit, the gracious fruit, see Gal. v. 22, 23 and vi. 8, 9, which is sure to follow, will furnish an unerring, *an infallible evidence* that they "*have not believed in vain,*" nor "*followed cunningly devised fables.*"

Here is infallibility in man, and here only. Just as he who having sown his field with wheat, and now sees it growing and ripening to its natural perfection, is *infallibly* sure of the correctness of his action and anticipated conclusion, so is he infallibly sure of his present and hopeful future, who has sown to the spirit, and is now reaping life and peace, and that as an earnest of richer life to come. And does not the Saviour call us to the exercise of this course when He addresses us in the following words : "Beware of false prophets, which come to you in sheep's clothing, but inwardly they are ravening wolves. Ye shall know them by their fruits. Do men gather grapes of thorns, or figs of thistles ? Even so every good tree bringeth forth good fruit, but a corrupt tree bringeth forth evil fruit. A good tree cannot bring forth evil fruit, neither can a corrupt tree bring forth good fruit, therefore by their fruit ye shall know them." Matt. vii. 16, 20. "Beloved, believe not every spirit, but try the spirits whether they are of God. because many false prophets are gone out into the world. Hereby know ye the spirit of God : Every spirit that confesseth that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh is of God." "Hereby know ye the spirit of truth and the spirit of error." "If we love one another, God dwelleth in us, and his love is perfected in us." John iv. 1, 2, 6, 12, and then as to our own state we exclaim if real Christians, with St. John, 1 John, 2, 3 : "Beloved now are we the sons of God, and it doth not yet appear what we shall be, but we know that when he shall appear we shall be like him, for we shall see him as he is. And every man that hath this hope in him purifieth himself, as he is pure" ; with which the doctrine by St. Paul is equally clear and satisfactory : "In whom ye also trusted, after that ye heard the word of truth, the Gospel of your salvation, in whom also, after that ye believed, ye were sealed with that Holy Spirit of promise, which is the earnest of our inheritance until the redemption of the purchased possession 'unto the praise of his glory.'" Eph. i. 13, 14.

Nor should I forget to mention here that the sad and lamentable cases of defection which have been given of the popes,—and the same may be said of the great body of the clergy, bishops, &c., go to disprove the dogma of apostolical succession, as held by the Church of Rome and by a portion of the Protestant Church—if it be right to call such in the proper sense of the word Protestants.

To suppose that God would keep up a chain of ministerial succession through wicked and Christless men,—but especially though such monsters of error and wickedness as were many of the popes and their leading clergy,—is itself a monstrosity in belief only fit to be placed alongside of the Mormon ideas of the character and

status of the New Jerusalem Church. Judas by transgression fell from his apostleship and was cast out of the office he had disgraced ; but in view of this fact, shall we say that men to whom in character Judas might be considered a saint, have held office in the Church and been honoured of God as the medium for transmitting that office to others ? The thing is preposterous almost beyond comparison, and could be entertained only by men labouring under a judicial blindness.

That there is an apostolical succession, but of a very different character from the one above referred to, is a fact for which I as earnestly contend as against the other I earnestly protest. It is the succession of men who in the truly apostolical spirit and faith—whether in *this* or *that* church organization I am not concerned to prove or maintain—who have laboured or are labouring, as did the apostles, not to build up a sect or party, but to bring men “from darkness to light, and from the power of Satan unto God ; that they might receive forgiveness of sins, and inheritance among them which are sanctified by faith which is in Christ Jesus.” Acts 26 : 18.

To this work they are called, not by man, but by the Spirit of God ; and that not because they have received a special or collegiate education, but because they have learned the nature and power of the Gospel by its saving influence, in and upon their own hearts ; and because of this knowledge, which can be obtained by experience only, and because of gifts with which God has qualified them to preach his Gospel (for God no more sends *tongueless* men to preach His Gospel than he does *brainless* or *heartless ones*) they, as St. Paul constrained by “the love of Christ,” and sensible that a dispensation of the Gospel is committed unto them, go forth to preach,—not the wonderful properties of their office or Church, but rather the *unsearchable riches of the Gospel* of Christ, and thus become instrumental in the hand of the Lord in saving their fellow men “from the wrath to come.”

The first step in this order is the *conversion* and *regeneration* of the person to God, and that not by human, but by divine power, even that of the Holy Spirit. See John I. 13, and Rom. VIII. 1-17.

The second step is the call by the Holy Spirit producing deep and stirring impressions that a dispensation of the Gospel is committed unto them ; and woe is unto them if they preach it not. 1. Cor. IX. 16-17.

The third is the bestowment of the requisite *gifts* and *graces* for the work, which fact is to be apprehended and certified by godly and competent men—ministers or laymen—by which authentication he may have good report and proper recognition of those who love the Lord Jesus Christ in sincerity, and by the world at large. Then will follow as a necessary consequence the ordination or formal induction into the office (for everything, the induction of a minister especially, should be done decently and in order in the Church of God) for the work assigned to him. Nor will such, we may rest assured, “labor in vain or spend their strength for naught,” for the promise of the Lord, “Lo, I am with you always, even unto the end of the world,” will be fulfilled, and good and gracious fruit will follow through the attending blessing of the Lord. He may have had more or less literary training,—the more the better ; he may or he may not have had the

highest clerical recognition or sanction, as such are regarded among men of this world ; but having had the training which the Holy Spirit gives, and by which a knowledge of salvation only is acquired, and having had gifts from above and indispensable for the performance of ministerial duties, he goes out in the truly apostolical line or succession, stamped by heaven's own signet, and impelled by Jesu's own spirit, and is at once recognized by the spiritually minded, who only are the true body or Church of Christ, as an ambassador of the Lord Christ, a minister of the New Testament of the world's Redeemer.

Such men have ever been in the world since the days of the apostles to the present. They have not always been seen and known by the world, because it has looked in the wrong place and direction to find them; nor has the world ever been without a spiritually minded Church, though many times but small and weak, to welcome them, to hold up their hands, and to rejoice in their labours. Neither have been fully known ; nay, neither have been but very imperfectly if at all known by the world, because they have long abode in comparative obscurity to be screened from their enemies and persecutors (as see Rev. 12 : 6), being built upon the true faith,—on the rock of Peter's confession,—the gates of hell, though many times assailing, in terrible persecutions,—those of the fallen church of Rome especially,—yet they have never prevailed against it so as utterly to destroy it. And now as, according to prophecy, the church is coming up out of the wilderness leaning on the beloved ; and as now her beauty (the beauty of holiness) begins to shine forth before the world we may expect that those who have long defrauded her of her *name* and of her *hold upon the hearts and minds*, the *affection* and *intelligence* of the world—will be seen ere long despoiled of their borrowed—nay stolen—plumes ; while the world will wonder how for so long a time it was misled, misled so as to call her the true Church of Christ which centuries ago was described as the very opposite by the apocalyptic seer ; some of whose descriptive and telling words are as follows : “And I saw a woman sit upon a scarlet coloured beast, full of names of blasphemy, having seven heads and ten horns, and the woman was arrayed in purple and scarlet colour, and decked with gold and precious stones and pearls, having a golden cup in her hand full of abominations and filthiness of her fornication ; and upon her head was a name written, Mystery, Babylon the Great, the mother of harlots and abominations of the earth ; and I saw the woman drunken with the blood of the saints, and with the blood of the Martyrs of Jesus ; and when I saw her, I wondered with great admiration.” Rev. 17 : 1-6 “Here is wisdom,” let all study it.

Yours truly in the Lord,

JOHN BORLAND.

LETTER V.

IMPORTANT MATTERS MET—MINOR ONES ATTENDED TO—THE TESTIMONY OF THE WISE, &C., CONSIDERED—CAN PROTESTANTS TELL WHICH ARE THE SCRIPTURES—DR. DÖELLINGER ON NATIONAL AND OTHER CHURCHES—POPE CLEMENT XIV.—HIS PROTESTANT TESTIMONY—DR. MANNING'S ALSO—ROMANIST MISTAKES—A KNOWLEDGE OF THE WHOLE BIBLE NOT INDISPENSABLE—TREATMENT OF THE HOLY VIRGIN—BY PROTESTANTS COMPLAINED OF—BY ROMANIST'S CONDEMNED—GOTIER'S MISTAKE AND CONDEMNATION—THE ROMAN CHURCH IDOLATROUS—NUTS TO CRACK.

MY DEAR L—

☛ In looking again over the last lengthy communication of your "friend," I do not see anything of moment in it that is not more than met in my previous letters; but lest he should think differently, and imagine that one or two minor particulars are passed by on the supposition of their being unanswerable, I will give to them a notice they scarcely deserve.

He says, "each Catholic has the Scripture explained by all that was ever wise, learned and good in the Church of God." This is merest assumption, which will be shown at once by your "friend" giving his authorities for any *one* point, for instance in the doctrine of transubstantiation, for I pledge myself to give as many names of "the wise, learned and good," and reckoned such by his own Church, *against* the views which he would maintain as he can for them. Let him begin with the leading article, transubstantiation itself, and if he or any of his coreligionists will try their hand at the work, the question shall be quickly and fully tested and settled.

"If the Bible is the only 'rule of Faith' can the Protestants tell us with certainty what are the books of which it is composed?" A variety of Remarks are suggested by this question which, if I mistake not, would make your "friend" look a little ridiculous. But I will forbear, and confine myself to a simple and straightforward reply. Here we have the assumption that the Church of Rome, and as she now is, is the only Christian Church that has existed since the days of the Apostles until the rise of that called "Protestant." Now here again is assumption *versus* facts. And in order to establish this statement I need only refer you to my quotation from Dr. Döellinger in my third letter. And I refer to him (I repeat my former statement,) because he yet *lives a Catholic, and was in full communion with the Church of Rome when he gave the facts I now quote from him.*

He says, you will recollect (p. 26), "There are many national Churches which were never under Rome," &c., &c., among which were the ancient British Church, which did not merge into that of Rome until the end of the sixth century. And then that in Ireland. It remained independent until the latter *half of the twelfth century.* It was then that the English Pope, Adrian, granted permission to Henry, the King of England, to conquer and subdue Ireland. The King promised the Pope he would "*exterminate the seeds of immorality, and turn the brutal Irish,*

who were Christians only in name, to the faith and to the way of truth." And the Pope bestowing his benediction on the King, did so, saying, on account of his resolution to conquer Ireland, "he would obtain glory on earth and felicity in heaven." Then, as to the ancient Church of Rome itself, it was sufficiently Christian up to the latter part of *the ninth century*, so as not to interfere with, but rather to encourage the circulation and reading of God's holy Word. Hence, what with the Jewish Church which held, as it now holds faithfully, the canon of the Old Testament Scriptures (in which canon by the way, be it observed, there is not, no more than in that of the Protestant, the books of the Apocrypha), the Scriptures were to be obtained without any reference to the degenerated Church of Rome, as it now is. Therefore, when any one asks such questions as this one I now answer of your "friend," he either shows his own ignorance of ecclesiastical history, or presumes most disingenuously on that of the person he interrogates.

Your "friend" next gives you a string of difficulties (which doubtless he regards as insurmountable) which he sees lying in the way of the Protestant rule of faith. But suppose all he says of difficulty were fully admitted, would such make his rule of faith less impracticable and impossible? I have shown his rule of faith to be altogether impracticable, that it never has been applied and never can be, so that, if he were to succeed, as he thinks he has, in proving as much of the Protestant's, what then? Why, that either there was no such thing as a rule of faith at all and it was God's purpose that mankind should do without any, and be like the ship sent to navigate the sea without compass or chart, or that neither the Romanist nor the Protestant had yet found what that rule was.

I maintain that in my previous letters I have shown that we Protestants have the true and infallible rule of faith; whilst Romanism, in her great changes since the ninth century, has gone drifting over the sea of doubt and uncertainty, and being completely in a fog thinks every one else is as badly off as herself. But these objections of your "friend" against the use of the Scriptures as a rule of faith are met even by Pope Clement 14, who in *vol. I. XIV. letter 40*, says: "The Gospels contain the religion of Christ, and are so plain that *the meanest capacity can comprehend them.*" And Dr. Manning in his "Moral Entertainment" observes: "The answer of Christ to the young man who wished to know from him the way of salvation, saying, 'How readeest thou?' teacheth us that if we will be rightly instructed in the ways of salvation, we must go to the *divinely inspired writings.* The Gospel is that which we must follow; by it we must be judged, and by it stand or fall in that day; and happy is he that shall be found able to meet that awful question of the great Judge, *How readeest thou?*"

Taking now the reasonings of your "friend" against the reading and submission to the teaching of Holy Scriptures, what a nice instance of *unanimity between him and the authorities he writes under* (and they are many) *and the above authorities whose words I give!*

Hi error, real or apparent, is in supposing that because Protestants contend for the use,—free, frequent, and individual—of the Holy Scriptures, that therefore we set aside, or in any way undervalue, the preaching of the Word, and our duty in hearing it. Preaching we regard as *the leading instrumentality* (differing thereby from the present Church of Rome, who think the performance of Mass

to be such), appointed by God for the conversion and salvation of the world. But inasmuch as by such words as those of St. Paul, Gal. 1 : 8, " Though we or an angel from heaven preach any other Gospel to you than that which we have preached unto you, let him be accursed," we are exhorted to the exercise of personal judgment,—and that as to the doctrinal preaching,—not of popes, bishops, or priests, but of those immeasurably above them, even apostles or angels,—we need something to guide our judgment by, we take as the next best to the Saviour himself or his divinely inspired apostles, the word which they have left us. And as in compliance with their express or clearly implied commands we were rendering the required obedience, should we not be more than a little surprised in being met by men assuming to be the only authorized exponents of the divine will, who forbade our act, and threatened us with imprisonment and pains, even unto death, if we dared by obeying God to disobey them? We doubtless would have many surmisings under such circumstances, but not certainly of such a character as would redound to the honor or credit of these obstructionists.

One more misapprehension your "friend" evidently labors under, I will remove and then pass on. He writes you, as though it were if the whole Bible was not possessed, and that with a certain knowledge of its divine character and import, saving faith could not by any one be attained or exercised. To this it would be a sufficient reply to ask, Did our Lord or His apostles propound and establish the *whole* truth of each book of the Holy Scriptures ere they demanded the hearty reception of and faith in the Saviour's divine character and mission? We believe the *whole* Bible valuable, and important "for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, and for instruction in righteousness;" but even as it is not essential to the maintenance of natural life that we should eat of every kind of fruit, grain, vegetable, and flesh, which God in His gracious providence has given to us; that a chemist or naturalist should demonstrate to us the life-giving properties of each article of food ere we partook of it, so is it not absolutely necessary to possess the whole Bible, and have demonstrated to us beyond a question that it is God's book, and therefore truly divine, ere we attain to saving faith in Christ.

It is enough that the sinner learn the leading truths of his condition, relation to God, redemption by Christ Jesus, with the conditions and duties of religion; nor, indeed, is even the whole of this essential, absolutely, as see Acts 16 : 31. All this, we are thankful to say, may be obtained from much less than a whole Bible; therefore, while prizing as an invaluable boon the whole of the sacred Scriptures, we nevertheless would content ourselves with a part, or that part of them which our Heavenly Master saw it right to bestow upon us.

I will now come to the concluding portion of your "friend's" long epistle. It is, you will recollect, on the differing views and actions of Protestants and Romanists towards the Virgin Mary. Romanists affect to regard Protestants as guilty of great sin in not treating the Virgin Mary with due honor; while Protestants regard Romanists as guilty of idolatry towards that holy woman, and of gross dishonor to the Saviour in the course they pursue towards her.

His first letter on this subject was much more full and argumentative than is this his second one. Here he looks like a bird that had been winged in its flight, and could now do little more than flutter.

Protestants are said not to honor the Virgin aright, because they do not regard her as "the mother of God" and "the Queen of Heaven;" and further, because they do not worship and pray to her. This, we are told, cannot but be very offensive to the divine Son especially, and for which, doubtless, we may expect His heaviest judgments.

But let us again, and at greater length than before, examine this subject.

Protestants cannot regard the Virgin Mary as "the mother of God," because such is an absurdity. God had no beginning, therefore could not have, as a consequence, a *mother*. The human nature of Christ had a beginning, and had that beginning in the womb of Mary. She was the exalted and honored mother of the human nature of our Lord, and therefore in that sense may be called the *mother of our Lord*. But when, because of the union of the human nature with the divine, and because that person of mysteriously complex nature was called, and properly, God as well as man, Mary is called *the mother of God*, we draw back shocked at the unauthorized and in a marked sense blasphemous utterance. To call her the Queen of Heaven is equally without Scriptural warrant, and equally without any becoming sense of propriety.

Romanists worship Mary, paying her divine honors, and take exception against Protestants for not doing the same. In this, I may remark, we have an instance of Protestant consistency with the ancient faith, and of Romanist novelty and departure in another and striking instance from "*the faith once delivered to the saints*." The apostles and primitive Christians knew nothing of this worship. Who, then, belong to their faith and practice, and of consequence to their Church?

The Saviour, evidently foreseeing that improper worship and service would be paid to His honored mother, gave a note of warning on the subject in the following language; and here we have another one of many notable instances of the importance of the Word of God for the guidance of our faith and practice. Look at and ponder the following passages:

"While he yet talked to the people, behold, his mother and his brethren stood without desiring to speak with him. Then one said unto him, Behold, thy mother and thy brethren stand without, desiring to speak with thee. But he answered and said unto him that told him, Who is my mother? and who are my brethren? and he stretched forth his hand toward his disciples, and said, Behold my mother and my brethren! For whosoever shall do the will of my Father which is in heaven, the same is my brother, and sister, and mother." *Matt 12: 46-50*. "And it came to pass, as he spake these things, a certain woman of the company lifted up her voice, and said unto him, Blessed is the womb that bare thee, and the paps which thou hast sucked. But he said, yea rather, blessed are they that hear the word of God, and keep it." *Luke 11: 27-28*. These Scriptures show most distinctly that a spiritual relation to Christ, brought about by a *readiness to hear*, and a consistency *in doing the will of God*, is greatly before the merely natural relation of Mary as his mother, great, unquestionably great, in honor and distinction as that relation must be admitted to be.

Hence we believe that Mary's honor in being selected to be the natural mother of our Lord was based upon her spiritual or truly religious character; and

that she "magnified the Lord and that her spirit rejoiced in God her Saviour." *Luke 1: 46-47*, shows that her true spiritual greatness and distinction arose from the earnestness and heartiness of her faith in God her Saviour, who in His human nature was to be born of her by the power of the Holy Ghost, rather than by the fact of that conception and birth thus effected.

Let Romanists leave the Virgin Mary—whom we all unite in saying was blessed among women—where the Holy Scriptures have put her, and then there will be no difference between Protestants and Romanists herein, nor, in this instance at least, between the Romanists of the *present* and those of the *ancient* Church of Rome. Your "friend" propounds and then answers the following question: "Do Catholics render the Most Blessed Virgin Mary the same worship and adoration as to Christ himself? Answer: No, for it would be an idolatry; but Catholics honor her eminent prerogatives with a degree of veneration INFINITELY INFERIOR to that which is due to God."

Using the words of your "friend," I say "attention here." If Catholics are convicted of rendering to Mary the same worship and adoration as to Christ himself, such "*would be an idolatry.*" "*Attention here,*" I again say, for we must look into this matter closely.

In an encyclical letter of Gregory XVI., dated Aug. 15, 1832, and addressed "to all patriarchs, primates, archbishops and bishops," he says: "We select for the date of our letter this most joyful day, on which we celebrate the solemn festival of the most blessed Virgin's triumphant assumption into heaven, that she who has been, through every great calamity, *our patroness and protectress*, may watch over us writing to you, and lead your mind, by her heavenly influence, to those counsels which may prove most salutary to Christ's flock.

"But that all may have a successful and happy issue, let us raise our eyes to the most blessed Virgin Mary, *who ALONE destroys heresies, who is our GREATEST HOPE, YEA, THE ENTIRE GROUND OF OUR HOPE.*"

Now what is all this, pray, if it be not giving to Mary, not only the *same worship and adoration*, but really *more than is paid to the Father, the Son, or the Holy Spirit*? For she is, observe, spoken of, as "*our greatest hope*;" yea, "*the entire ground of our hope!*" Could anything more than this be said of Christ? But this is said of Mary, and thus is she lifted above Christ, and herein worshipped not only with the same but even with greater worship and veneration. What is this, then, if not idolatry, even on your "friend's" authorities; and yet how these Romanist authorities contradict one another—as see "*Gother in his Papist Misrepresented.*" He says: "*Cursed is every goddess-worshipper* that believes the Blessed Virgin Mary to be any more than a creature; that worships her, or puts his trust in her more than in God; that believes her above her Son, or that she can in anything command Him. Amen."

And yet with such language on his lips or expressed by his pen, he knew that the following was in the Roman Breviary: "If the winds of temptation arise, if thou run upon the rocks of tribulation, look to the star, call upon Mary. If thou art tossed upon the waves of pride, of ambition, of detraction, of envy, look to the star, call upon Mary. If anger, or avarice, or the temptations of the flesh toss the bark of thy mind, look to Mary. If disturbed with the greatness of thy sins,

troubled at thy defilement of the conscience, affrighted at the horrors of the judgment, thou beginnest to be swallowed up in the gulf of sadness, the abyss of despair, think upon Mary—in dangers, in difficulties, in doubts, think upon Mary, invoke Mary. Let her not depart from thy mouth, let her not depart from thy heart, “&c., &c.

Now if such language does not imply *the highest trust in Mary* that it is possible to exercise in Jesus, the Saviour; in God, the Father; and in the Holy Ghost, the Sanctifier, then I confess I have lost the knowledge of some of the plainest terms in our language. But this is not all. Seymour in his “Mornings among the Jesuits at Rome” (which as in parenthesis I would recommend to general reading and reflection), in a conversation on this very subject with certain leading Jesuits in Rome, referred to a well-known prayer, to the saying of which, in the year 1817, was attached an indulgence of 300 days; it was in these words: “Jesus, Joseph, Mary, I give you my heart and soul; Jesus, Joseph, Mary, assist me in my last agony; Jesus, Joseph, Mary, I breathe my soul to you in peace.” Here again we have the same worship and adoration to the creature as to Christ himself. But still more striking is the following, in a work by St. Alphonso de Liguori. It is entitled “The Glories of Mary.” In it among other things is described the vision of St. Bernard, in which he beheld two ladders extending from earth to heaven—two ways by which the sinner could have access to heaven. At the top of one ladder appeared Jesus Christ; at the top of the other ladder appeared the Virgin Mary; and that, while those who endeavoured to enter into heaven by the way of Christ’s ladder fell constantly back and utterly failed; those, on the other hand, who tried to enter by the ladder of Mary, all succeeded, because she put forth her hands to assist and encourage them.” Mr. Seymour says that he saw this as an altar piece in a church in Milan, where the two ladders were represented reaching from earth to heaven; “Jesus Christ at the head of one, and Mary at the head of the other, and while none were succeeding by the ladder of Christ, all were succeeding by the ladder of the Virgin.” These statements were admitted and even defended by the Jesuits with whom Mr. Seymour conversed, while they assured him that “*God hears our prayers more quickly when they are offered through the Blessed Virgin than when offered through any one else, or than to, or through Christ!!!*”

Now what does all this amount to? Why, 1st, that when Gotther says: “*cursed! is every goddess-worshipper,*” he pronounces a curse upon his whole Church, and when he inveighs against a Protestant for charging his Church with such, he does so to deceive whom he addresses, most assuredly. What a character, then, is his.

2nd. That the Virgin Mary not only receives the same worship and adoration with Christ, but in some—in many—instances is actually placed above Him; therefore, according to your “friend,” his Church are idolators!

3rd. That even were she worshipped in the subordinate worship of *hyperdoulia*, as it is pretended she is by the Romanist, they would still be chargeable with not only grievous errors, but with gravest idolatry.

That the Church of Rome in offering even subordinate worship to Mary is chargeable with gravest errors, for it supposes her invested with the attributes of *omnipresence* and *omniscience*,—attributes which belong to deity alone. For of these

she must be possessed if she hears prayers addressed to her at the same time and in different parts of the world. Yes, the Church of Rome is guilty of idolatry ; for the worship which the Israelites offered to the golden calf when Moses was on the Mount with God, was of this very subordinate character. They did not ignore Jehovah's existence, or imagine that supreme worship should not be offered Him ; but as Moses the servant of God had left them, and they knew not, or affected not to know, that he would ever return, they made a god of gold like unto a calf, and worshipped it. But for this Jehovah was very angry ; nor less so Moses himself. The whole aspect and condition of their affairs were affected by this act ; nor was it till three thousand of them were slain as a punishment, and Moses had spent much time in most earnest intercession in their behalf, that God consented to again become their leader to the promised land. With a knowledge which they had of God's supremacy and glory, as attested by His many miracles in their favour, they could not, nor did they, by ignoring such refuse Him worship and adoration. But like the Romanists of our day, they wanted an inferior deity—the one a calf in the place of Moses, and the other the Virgin Mary in the place of Christ ;—they, therefore, made to themselves a calf and worshipped it,—with *hyperdulia*n worship, doubtless.—

The steps by which the Church of Rome has receded from the position of primitive Christianity, is a striking lesson as to the folly and danger of abandoning the Word of God ; and as well for any one to give up the use of his reason and understanding to follow implicitly erring, and in not a few instances, as sufficiently proved, designing and wicked men—men who have not hesitated to make merchandise of the souls and bodies of their fellows, while forbidding the existence of a doubt or question at all affecting their wisdom or goodness, or right and authority for doing what *they* deemed it right for themselves or others to do.

Their introduction and use of the dogma of purgatory is another striking illustration of this. Of this discovery and use, Dr. Doellinger, *the Catholic*, writes as follows : (see his work *Janus*, p. 230.) : “Agostino Trionfo of Ancona, an Augustinian Monk, who wrote his *Summa* on the Church by command of John XXII. had already discovered a new kingdom for the Pope to rule over. It had been said before that the power of God's Vicar extended over two realms, the earthly and the heavenly, meaning by the latter that the Pope could open or close heaven at his pleasure. From the end of the thirteenth century a third realm was added, the empire over which was assigned to the Pope by the theologians of the Curia—Purgatory. Trionfo, commissioned by John XXII. to expound the rights of the Pope, showed that, as the dispenser of the merits of Christ, he could empty purgatory at a stroke, by his indulgences, of all the souls detained there, on the sole condition that somebody fulfilled the rules laid down for gaining those indulgences ; he advises the Pope, however, not to do this.” (*Summa de Pot. Eccl. Rimae* 1584, p. 193).

Now here is a fact : this changing, shifting Church of Rome about the close of the thirteenth century discovers purgatory, and see what use since then she has made of it ! What marvellous sums of money it has brought her ! What marvellous power it has enabled her to wield over her people ! And yet how well

she has managed to keep the people from detecting and denouncing this imposition ! All because she succeeded in putting the Bible out of sight and out of use ; so that now, blindfolded, she leads her people at her pleasure.

I trust that these letters to you may induce some Romanist to ponder and think for himself ; and that many with him may yet follow no man, or men, but as they follow Christ and walk before them in the light of the revealed will of God, the inspired and Holy Scriptures, given to all for this very purpose.

I will ere I close give your "friend" a nut or two to crack ; a couple of syllogisms on which he may try his logic.

FIRST.

The rule of faith which God has given His Church for its guidance is consistent with itself, and with the character and relations of the Church.

But the rule of faith held by the Church of Rome is not consistent with itself, nor with the character and relations of the Church :

Therefore, the rule of faith held by the Church of Rome is not that which God has given the Church for guidance.

SECOND.

The true Church of God, guided as it must be by the Word and Spirit of God, is ever consistent with herself and with God's Word and Spirit.

But the Church of Rome is not consistent with herself nor with the Word and Spirit of God :

Therefore, the Church of Rome is not the true Church of God.

To the merits of these syllogisms I call "*attention*."

1st. The rule of faith held by the Church of Rome is not consistent with itself, nor with the character and relations of the Church.

This rule of faith is inconsistent with the Church because it is impracticable, because contradictory : Pope vs. Pope ; Council vs. Council ; Council against the Pope, and the Pope against the Council ; and all very frequently and strikingly against the Word of God :—Therefore, &c., &c.

2. The Church of Rome is not consistent with herself, nor with the Word and Spirit of God. In her primitive days she was in accord with those principles of faith and love to God and all mankind propounded in the Word of God and illustrated in the life of the Saviour. Since then she has lost the doctrine of justification by faith, regeneration by the Holy Spirit. Further, she has become worldly, ambitious of secular power, and of an intolerant and persecuting spirit. She sells the gifts of God for money, making merchandise of men's souls, and compasses sea and land to make proselytes—not to God but to *her* faith and service. Therefore, &c., &c.

When your "friend" has succeeded in cracking these nuts, I shall be prepared with others on which he may still further try his skill.

I am, my dear young friend,
Your servant and Pastor,

JOHN BORLAND

ERRATA.

Page 7, line 19—After the word “Church,” read *of Rome*.

“ 9, second last line—For the word “secure” read *receive*.

“ 10, line 4—For “can divest himself,” read *should, &c.*

29